HISTORY *of* DOGMAS

TIXERONT

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
FEB 11 1942
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BT 23 .T5913 1930 v.1
Tixeront, J. 1856-1925.
History of dogmas

v.1

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
FEB 11 1942
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

HISTORY OF DOGMAS

BY

J. TIXERONT

TRANSLATED FROM THE FIFTH FRENCH EDITION

BY

H. L. B.

VOL. I

THE ANTENICENE THEOLOGY

THIRD EDITION

B. HERDER BOOK CO.
17 SOUTH BROADWAY, ST. LOUIS, MO.
AND
33 QUEEN SQUARE, LONDON, W. C.
1930

NIHIL OBSTAT.

Sti. Ludovici, die 18. Oct. 1910.

F. G. HOLWECK,

Censor Librorum.

IMPRIMATUR.

Sti. Ludovici, die 18. Oct. 1910.

J. A. CONNOLLY, V. G.

Copyright, 1910, by Joseph Gummersbach.

THE TRANSLATOR'S FOREWORD

The imperious need of a History of Dogmas, written in English from a Catholic and scientific standpoint, is the motive that has prompted the translator to render this work into English.

He offers his thanks to all those, among his associates or among his pupils, who have contributed, in some way or other, by encouragement or active coöperation, to lessen the difficulties of his task.

The translation of quotations from the Greek or Latin Fathers is substantially that of the *Ante Nicene Fathers.*

H. L. B.

THE AUTHOR'S PREFACE

This volume is the first of a *History of Dogmas in Ancient Theology*, which at first was intended to be complete in one volume; its importance, however, is so great, and the material for its composition so abundant, as to have obliged me to divide it into two parts. The eagerness with which this first volume has been called for, has decided me not to delay the printing of it, until the second is ready. Besides, it treats of a well defined epoch and, strictly speaking, constitutes by itself an independent whole.

The method adopted in its composition is the method which, later on, I call *synthetic*, viz., I have generally followed the chronological order, setting forth at the same time all the doctrine of each author or document, and following up, so to speak, the history of all the dogmas. Any other method was scarcely practical, because of the character of the epoch to be described: an epoch when great controversies had not yet arisen and strictly so called definitions on the part of the Church had not yet been made. I am fully aware that such a method may put Theologians to some inconvenience; for, while they are anxious to have, grouped together, all the texts referring to a certain subject, in the present work, they are obliged, in order to find those texts, to go through the whole book. But, although such an inconvenience can scarcely be avoided, I have tried to remove it, as much as I could, by placing, at the end of the volume, an analytical table by means of which it will be easy to make out, in a short time, the series of testimonies and teachings of the first three centuries, on this or that point of doctrine.

There are some, perhaps, who would prefer to see the texts quoted exclusively from Migne's Greek and Latin Patrology, with the indication of the page and column, where they are to be found. Such a constraint I did not think it wise to impose on myself. For, in the first place, however useful and valuable Migne's editions are, they are not always faultless nor even sufficiently complete. Secondly, there are instances in which the works I referred to are divided into rather short sections, and then, the indication of the pages was thought superfluous. Still, such an indication is sometimes really useful or even necessary, and when that is so, it will be given.

Notes, placed at the beginning of chapters or of paragraphs, give lists of the principal works referring to the author or subject in question; which lists it will be easy to complete by consulting U. Chevalier's *Répertoire des Sources Historiques du Moyen Age, Bio-bibliographie*, a second edition of which is now being published, and O. Bardenhewer's *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Litteratur.* Generally I have omitted works somewhat old and mere review articles, as well as articles of those dictionaries which of course are always to be consulted, such as the *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, the *Kirchenlexicon*, the *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, etc. As to histories of dogma, strictly so called, the most important and the best known are mentioned at § 3 of the Introduction.

That the reading of these books, especially of some of them, has been of great profit to me, I fully acknowledge; still, it has always been for me only a preliminary to the careful study of the texts themselves. The reader of this book will find therein analyses and appreciations: whatever judgment he may pass on them, whether they seem to him exact or erroneous, he may feel assured that they rest on a personal and direct perusal of the documents themselves. To them, we must ultimately go back; and the chief purpose of this book is precisely to make the study of them more easy. And so, these pages should not be considered as a work complete and self-sufficing, but as an instrument for further work, and as a guide in the study of the doctrinal monuments left us by Christian antiquity.

LYONS, December, 1904.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

PAGE
§ 1. Notion of the History of Dogmas; Its Object and Limits 1
§ 2. Sources of the History of Dogmas. Various Methods which may be followed. Its Divisions 7
§ 3. Principal Works on the History of Dogmas 11

CHAPTER I

ON THE RELIGIOUS, PHILOSOPHICAL AND MORAL DOCTRINES IN THE MIDST OF WHICH CHRISTIAN DOGMA APPEARED AND BEGAN ITS DEVELOPMENT

§ 1. Greco-Roman Religion and Philosophy at the time of Christ and until the Middle of the Second Century 18
§ 2. Religious and Moral Doctrines of the Jews at the Time of the Coming of Jesus. Palestinian Judaism 29
§ 3. Alexandrian Judaism and that of the Dispersion. Philo 43

CHAPTER II

THE EARLY STATE OF CHRISTIAN DOGMA. PREACHING OF JESUS CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES

§ 1. The Personal Teaching of Jesus Christ, according to the Synoptists 59
§ 2. The Teaching of Jesus, according to St. John 72
§ 3. The Teaching of St. Paul 76
§ 4. The Teaching of the Apostles besides St. Paul and St. John . . . 91
§ 5. The Teaching of St. John 97

CHAPTER III

THE TESTIMONY OF THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS

§ 1. Preliminary Remarks 104
§ 2. The First Epistle of St. Clement 107
§ 3. The Shepherd of Hermas 111
§ 4. The Second Epistle of St. Clement 119
§ 5. The Epistles of St. Ignatius 121
§ 6. The Epistle and the "Martyrium" of St. Polycarp. Papias 132

PAGE
§ 7. The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles 135
§ 8. The Epistle of Barnabas 139
§ 9. The Symbols of Faith 142

CHAPTER IV

THE FIRST DEFORMATIONS OF CHRISTIAN DOGMA. THE HERESIES OF THE SECOND CENTURY

§ 1. Judæo-Christianity in the Time of St. Paul 150
§ 2. The Beginnings of Judaizing Gnosticism. The Nicolaitans. Cerinthus 153
§ 3. Judæo-Christianity in the Second Century 159
§ 4. Gnosticism 170
§ 5. Marcionitism 183
§ 6. Tatian and the Encratites 190
§ 7. Montanism. The Alogi 192
§ 8. Millenarianism 199

CHAPTER V

THE DOCTRINAL STRUGGLE AGAINST HEATHENISM; BEGINNINGS OF SPECULATIVE THEOLOGY. THE APOLOGISTS OF THE SECOND CENTURY

§ 1. General Remarks on the Apologists 203
§ 2. The Apologetics of the Apologists, and Their Concept of Revelation 206
§ 3. Christian Doctrine in the Apologists 213

CHAPTER VI

THE DOCTRINAL STRUGGLE AGAINST HERESY. ST. IRENÆUS AND MELITO . 228

CHAPTER VII

THE PRINCIPAL EARLY THEOLOGICAL SYSTEMS IN THE EAST

§ 1. Clement of Alexandria 243
§ 2. Origen 256

CHAPTER VIII

THE CHRISTOLOGICAL AND TRINITARIAN CONTROVERSIES IN THE WEST AT THE END OF THE SECOND AND THE BEGINNING OF THE THIRD CENTURY

§ 1. Adoptionism 287
§ 2. Patripassian Monarchianism 290
§ 3. Opposition to Monarchianism 293

CHAPTER IX

THE FOUNDERS OF LATIN THEOLOGY. ST. HIPPOLYTUS, TERTULLIAN, NOVATIAN

PAGE
§ 1. St. Hippolytus. The "Philosophoumena" 298
§ 2. Tertullian 304
§ 3. Novatian 326

CHAPTER X

THE QUESTION OF PENANCE IN THE WEST DURING THE THIRD CENTURY. NOVATIANISM

§ 1. The Question of Penance in Rome, under Callistus 337
§ 2. The Question of Penance in Africa. Novatianism 346

CHAPTER XI

ST. CYPRIAN AND THE BAPTISMAL CONTROVERSY

§ 1. St. Cyprian's Theology . , ... 355
§ 2. The Baptismal Controversy 366

CHAPTER XII

THEOLOGY IN THE EAST FROM ORIGEN UNTIL THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA

§ 1. The Successors and Disciples of Origen. St. Dionysius of Alexandria 377
§ 2. Theognostus and Pierius 386
§ 3. St. Gregory Thaumaturgus. Hieracas 388
§ 4. Writers independent of or opposed to Origen. St. Peter of Alexandria 391
§ 5. St. Methodius of Olympus 392
§ 6. The Dialogue *De recta in Deum fide* 397

CHAPTER XIII

THE EASTERN HERESIES OF THE END OF THE THIRD CENTURY

§ 1. The Adoptionism of Paul of Samosata 400
§ 2. Manicheism 404

CHAPTER XIV

THE WESTERN THEOLOGIANS AT THE END OF THE THIRD AND AT THE BEGINNING OF THE FOURTH CENTURY

PAGE
§ 1. Arnobius and Lactantius 412
§ 2. Commodian 420

CHAPTER XV

THE DOCTRINE AND THEOLOGY OF THE CHURCH ON THE EVE OF ARIANISM

Analytical Table 424

INDEX 433

THE
ANTENICENE THEOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

§ 1. Notion of the History of Dogmas, its Object and Limits.

THE primary meaning of the word dogma, δόγμα, is that of a command, a decree, a doctrine which forces itself upon us. It is used by St. Luke to designate the edict of Augustus relative to the census of the Empire (*Luke*, 2^{1}), and is used in a similar sense in *Acts*, 16^{4}; 17^{7}; *Ephes.*, 2^{15}; *Coloss.*, 2^{14}. Besides, Cicero writes: *Sapientiae vero quid futurum est? Quae neque de seipsa dubitare debet, neque de suis decretis quae philosophi vocant* δόγματα, *quorum nullum sine scelere prodi poterit:*[1] in this passage are meant philosophical doctrines which the mind must accept. It is with this last signification that the ecclesiastical acceptation of the word is connected. About the year 335, Marcellus of Ancyra includes in dogma the rules of Christian morality;[2] but a few years later, Gregory of Nyssa applies the expression to the object of Christian faith only: "Christ divides the Christian discipline into two [parts]: the part referring to morals, and that referring to the exactness of dogmas."[3]

This last use has prevailed. A dogma is, then, a truth revealed, and defined as such by the Church, a truth which the faith of the Christian is obliged to accept. We call *dogma* or *dogmas,* the collection of all the truths thus revealed and defined.

---

[1] *Academ.*, Book II, 9.

[2] EUSEB., *Contra Marcell.*, I, 4; *P. G.*, XXIV, 756, C.

[3] *Epist.* 24; *P. G.*, XLVI, 1089, A; Διαιρεῖ (ὁ Χριστὸς) εἰς δύο τὴν τῶν Χριστιανῶν πολιτείαν , εἴς τε τὸ ἠθικὸν μέρος καὶ εἰς τὴν τῶν δογμάτων ἀκρίβειαν.

Strictly speaking, Christian *Dogma* is not the same as Christian *Doctrine.* The former supposes an explicit intervention on the part of the Church deciding a determinate point of doctrine; the latter covers a somewhat more extensive field; it includes not only the defined dogmas, but also the teachings that are ordinarily and currently propounded, with the full approval of the *magisterium.*

Dogmas are intended to be but the translation, into technical formulas, into clear and precise language, of the data of Revelation, of the teachings of Scripture and of early Christian Tradition. Between the teachings of Jesus or of St. Paul on one side, and those of the Council of Nicæa or of Trent, on the other, there is indeed no similarity in words, but there is equivalence, substantial identity. The latter do but reproduce the former. Such is the affirmation of the Catholic Church. Still, the question comes in: How was the transition made from the Gospel, St. Paul or St. Clement to the statements of Nicæa or to the Profession of Faith of Pius IV? What was the course followed by Christian thought in that evolution which thus brought it from the primitive elements of its doctrine to the development of its theology? What were its stages in that progress? What impulses, what suspensions, what hesitations did it undergo? What circumstances threatened to bring about its deviation from that path, and, as a matter of fact, in certain parts of the Christian community, what deviations *did* occur? By what men and how was this progress accomplished, and what were the ruling ideas, the dominant principles which determined its course? These questions the *History of Dogmas* must answer. Its object is, therefore, to set before our eyes the intimate working of Christian thought on the primitive data of Revelation; a working by means of which it grasps them more and more fully, illustrates them and makes them fruitful, develops them; and finally marshals them into a harmonious and scholarly system without however — so Catholics hold — altering their substance, or modifying their doctrinal ground-work.

And thus it is easy to see that the history of dogmas is but a part of Ecclesiastical History. For the latter must record the life of the Church, her internal and external life, the life of her belief and therefore of her faith, the vicissitudes that life has gone through, as well as the life and vicissitudes of her institutions and worship, the progress of her missionary work and the events with which her relations with the powers of this world have been marked. To believe and teach the truth is for that Church, the first of all blessings, as well as the first of all functions. Any Church History ever so little worthy of that name cannot pass by the history of her teaching and of her faith, the history of her dogmas.

It may now be useful to distinguish the history of Dogmas from the theological sciences that are somewhat related to it.

We have already mentioned the difference between Christian *Dogma* and Christian *Doctrine*, the latter being more extensive than the former. Hence, a history of Dogmas is not exactly a history of Christian Doctrine. As a matter of fact, however, and in practice, they must be almost blended together, since a history of Christian Doctrine necessarily includes the history of Dogmas, and since this last, in its turn, cannot present a full historical sketch of the teachings of the Church, if we exclude from it those of her teachings which have not yet been the object of solemn decisions.

But we must carefully mark the distinction between the *history of Theology* and the history of Dogmas; the former having for its purpose to expose, not merely the progress of the doctrines defined or generally received in the Church, but also the rise and growth of systems and views proper to particular Theologians; moreover, on the lives, works and method of those Theologians, it admits of details that are out of place in a history of Dogmas.

Again, the history of Dogmas should not be confounded with *Positive Theology* nor with *Patrology* and *Patristics*. Positive Theology is that science which establishes the truth of the Christian dogmas, by means of the precise testimonies of Scripture and Tradition, though without following their development through the course of ages: in it, more attention is given to demonstration than to history. As to Patrology and Patristics, both refer exclusively to those writers we call the Fathers of the Church. The former studies their lives and draws up the catalogue, sifts the authenticity and mentions the editions of their works, which, in a word, it considers chiefly from the outside; Patristics examines and exposes their doctrine, and reveals the treasures contained in them. Both, indeed, are for the history of Dogmas, subsidiary sciences and necessary auxiliaries; but the latter most assuredly goes beyond the field to which they are confined. For, besides the Fathers, the history of Dogmas consults other monuments of the Christian belief: symbols, liturgies, decrees of Councils, painted or sculptured memorials, etc. Far beyond the Patristic Age, it follows up, even to our own time, the evolution of Christian thought. Hence it constitutes by itself a distinct science with an object well defined and a field clearly determined.

Moreover, we may remark that the history of Dogmas can be treated with a twofold purpose, and that, in this respect, we might perhaps make a distinction between such a history and *Historical Theology*. In its treatment of facts and texts, the former sets aside any apologetical preoccupation, and ascertains, and relates, and exposes. He who takes it up can even deny any value, either to dogmatic statements or to the logical processes by means of which they are deduced. Such was Bossuet's attitude when he described the evolution of Protestant doctrines. Such is that of a Christian scholar who studies the history of the Brahmanic dogmas. Such is also the disposition with which many Protestant or Rationalistic writers treat the history of Dogmas; but we easily grant, that, without going as far as that indifference or hostility, an author, even a Christian author may not aim, in his researches, at proving directly the legitimate character of actual Christian teachings. On the contrary, that is the aim of *Historical Theology*, where history is not the end, but only a means; the end is a theological one; the purpose in view is to show, from the history of ideas and facts, that the actual faith is normally connected with the Apostolic faith, and that the Christians of to-day are truly the direct and lawful heirs of the disciples of Jesus.

After these distinctions, it seems easy to get an adequate idea of what the History of Dogmas really is. It is more difficult, though, to say to what precise time it must go back, and how far it includes or excludes the history of Revelation itself. For, as we have already seen, dogmas claim to have been revealed, and to be but Revelation reduced to formulas. If such a claim is justified, their primary origin is the revealing act or series of revealing acts, and their early shape, their substance are the teachings of the Old Testament, and of Jesus and the Apostles, in other words, the Theology of the Old and of the New Testament. Hence a complete history of Dogmas will include a history of Revelation and a sketch of that Theology. And any one who desires to examine the legitimacy of such a claim is brought back to the study of the early origin of Dogmas, and of the influence exercised on their formation, by Philosophy, surrounding religions, the authentic or apocryphal writings of the Old Testament, Jewish traditions, popular imagination, and, of course, the historical fact of the preaching of Jesus and the Prophets, etc. But, as is easy to realize, such a field is indeed rather extensive and belongs properly to a certain number of special sciences, apologetical and exegetical. It seems best for us to avoid this field, and not to busy ourselves in a history of Dogmas with the early sources of their contents. The work of Christian thought on those primitive data and the gradual transformation thus brought about make up the chief object of such a history; consequently, in order to point out the *terminus a quo* of the *processus* to be described, we will content ourselves with a mere sketch of the teachings of Jesus and the Apostles, as related in the New Testament. On the other hand, in order that we may be able to keep before our minds the subjective circumstances in which Christian thought began and continued its work, and the external influences to which, outside Revelation, it has been exposed or may have been subject, the history of Dogmas must both present to us an idea of the religious, philosophical and moral surroundings in which this work of Christian thought has been accomplished, and point out to us the foreign doctrines which may have acted on Christian thought and started it in a determined direction. Such a process will enable us to connect the history of Dogmas with the history of their origin, without at once denying or solving the many and delicate problems to which such questions give rise. At the same time, one may, for more extensive information, consult the works in which such problems are more deeply studied.[1]

[1] As I am not writing a book of Theology, I abstain from exposing here the theory of the development of Dogmas, such as it is conceived by Catholics or by Protestants. On this subject, cf. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonitorium*, I, 23, *P. L.*, L, 667–669; NEWMAN, *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, last Edition, and its criticism by J. B. MOZLEY, *Theory of Development, A Criticism of Dr. Newman's Essay*, 1879; DE LA BARRE, *La vie du Dcgme catholique*, Paris, 1898. Nor can I omit to mention, notwithstanding the fact of their being condemned, the two books of A. LOISY, *L'Evangile et l'Eglise*, second Edit., Bellevue, 1903 — translated into English, New York, 1904 and 1909 —; *Autour d'un petit Livre*, Paris, 1903. A few remarks may suffice for our

§ 2. Sources of the History of Dogmas. Various Methods which may be followed. Its Divisions.

There is scarcely any branch of Christian literature that can, nay should not be made use of for a history of Dogmas. To begin with, we must mention the very sources of dogma: first, Scripture, and the oral teachings of Jesus and the Apostles recorded in subsequent documents; then, the Creeds, Confessions of Faith, definitions of Councils and Popes, which have determined its bearing and accurately stated its mean-

---

aim. The history of Dogmas implies that those dogmas have passed through certain vicissitudes and have been subjected to certain developments or transformations; for those things alone have a history, which live and change. That, as a matter of fact, there have been such vicissitudes, cannot be doubted, and we have but to open our eyes to witness them. The important point is to determine their character and results, to point out their limits, causes and laws, in short to define how far the substance of dogmas is affected by that evolution. The question may be treated either by the *theoretical* method, *a priori*, which starts with what the Church teaches in regard to the substantial immutability of dogma, or *a posteriori*, by the *historical* method, which gathers up the results revealed by a careful study of the facts. This last method is of course the only one an historian can follow.

Protestant and Rationalistic authors affirm it has led them to the conclusion that the early data of Revelation have been not only scientifically exposed and developed, but also substantially altered and modified by subsequent dogma. Such, for instance, is Harnack's declaration in his "*Outlines of the History of Dogma*," Introduction, p. 7. Quite different indeed were, as is well known, the conclusions reached by Newman, still an Anglican, after the same historical researches; conclusions he has recorded in his famous *Essay*, above mentioned, most of which have been adopted by Catholic scholars. I will add only that, though the theory of the development of dogmas is at present studied a great deal, still it is far from being complete. Generally scholars have been too easily satisfied with vague formulas and mere comparisons, which are not precise enough (the child who becomes a man, the kernel that becomes a tree, etc.). For the question to be answered in a technical and adequate manner is this: When is an idea or a doctrine, a mere development of another idea or doctrine, and when is it to be considered a substantial alteration or transformation of it? The comparison of the oak which grows from the acorn shows us how greatly two doctrines may apparently differ, one of which, however, proceeds from the other. This is too much lost sight of by some authors, whose concept of dogmatic progress is evidently too narrow.

ing; and finally, the works of the Fathers and ancient ecclesiastical writers, and for a period nearer to us, the works of Theologians. Canonical and disciplinary decrees, liturgical prayers and chants, inscriptions and figured monuments may often supply precious indications as to the intimate beliefs of the Church at a certain epoch; apocryphal books and the works of heretics may provide the counterfeit and counterpart. Ecclesiastical history may light up, as it were, the surroundings in which those beliefs have grown, and by the very facts it relates, often bring forward witnesses of them more striking than the texts themselves. Finally — and our enumeration is far indeed from being exhaustive — he who desires to explain satisfactorily the influences under which Christian thought has developed, and to realize the bearing of dogmatic formulas, one element of which is philosophical terminology, must know by all means the philosophical and religious ideas prevalent in the various ages of the Church.

* * *

Two methods which may be followed in the History of Dogma, present themselves to us, the synthetic and the analytic. In other words, we may study the general history of Dogmas, by following the order of time, and setting forth the idea which each epoch or each principal author formed of the whole system or of the separate points of Christian doctrine; or we may take up a particular dogma or a particular group of dogmas referring to the same object — for instance, the Trinitarian dogma, — and follow its rise and development during a definite period, or even from the beginning of Christianity to our own days. The latter or analytic method enables us to get a deeper insight into the history of each dogma considered by itself and see its evolution better; however, it has the drawback of presenting only detached monographs, and of exhibiting, of the systems of great Theologians — such as Origen or Augustine — only the *disiecta membra*, which, of course, cannot make us read into their intimate and more general views. Moreover, if we consult history, we see that, though certain dogmas seem to have engrossed for a long time the attention of the Church, still the others were not altogether passed by. The first method, viz., the synthetic method, has, then, the advantage of being more in harmony with objective and concrete history; again, it enables us to point out better the ideas and beliefs prevalent at certain epochs, to show the mutual connection or subordination of several doctrines, and to set forth the general views of the writers who come under consideration. Owing to these advantages, it has been adopted by the more recent authors, and we will adopt it ourselves. We may observe, however, that between the two methods, intermediate combinations are possible, nay, often, necessary; in all this, there is nothing absolute.

* * *

The history of Dogmas begins with the preaching of Jesus and reaches to our own time, for even now Christian Doctrine continues to be determined and explained. However, in those nineteen centuries, it is easy to distinguish, as in the history of the Church in general, three periods quite distinct. The first embraces about the first eight centuries; it ends, in the East, with the Image Controversy and St. John Damascene († about 750); in the West, with the condemnation of Spanish Adoptionism, the last echo of Christological controversies, and with the name of Alcuin († 804). It was then that the fundamental dogmas were formed, discussed and defined: those of the Trinity and the Incarnation, in the East; those of sin, grace and the Church, in the West. — The second period begins with Charlemagne or even some years before, and includes all the Middle Ages, extending even to the

Reformation and the Council of Trent. During this period the Greek Church scarcely appears; the Latin Church seems to engross all activity. An extensive work of systematization picks up the doctrinal elements of Tradition, and, in a powerful synthesis, blends them with philosophical data, chiefly with those of the Aristotelian system. This was the age of the *Summae*, of the theology of the Sacraments, Indulgences and accessory devotions, and also of the theology of Ecclesiastical hierarchy and power. — With Protestantism and the Council of Trent, a third period opens. Whilst the former claims to go back to primitive teachings, by making Scripture the only doctrinal source, and faith, the only principle of justification, the latter sanctions most of the work of the Middle Ages, and engages with Naturalism, already broken out in the Renaissance, in a battle which is to continue in the following centuries. It is no longer this or that dogma which is at stake; now the very existence of the Church as a teaching authority, even the necessity of a definite dogmatic belief are challenged (Liberal Protestantism); the existence of the Supernatural and of Revelation (Rationalism); the belief in God and the value of human reason, are called in question (Atheism, Subjectivism). Although during this period, dogma has certainly developed, still it has been chiefly defended. Under its various forms, the science of Apologetics has been in the foreground.

The present volume will take up only the beginning of the history of Dogmas as far as the Council of Nicæa (325); another volume will carry the study up to Charlemagne.[1]

---

[1] Owing to the abundance of material, the author has been unable to fulfil his promise. The second volume — published in 1909 — carries the history of Dogmas from the age of St. Athanasius to that of St. Augustine only. A third volume will take the reader to the times of Charlemagne. T.

§ 3. Principal Works on the History of Dogmas.

In its present form the History of Dogmas is only one century old. Of course, the ancient authors who wrote about heresies, St. Irenæus, the author of the "Philosophoumena," the Pseudo-Tertullian, St. Epiphanius, Philastrius, Theodoret, etc., and the ecclesiastical historians, Eusebius and his continuators, have left us materials for the history of Doctrine in the first centuries; but they never thought of writing such a history. During the Middle Ages, the very idea of progress in Dogma seems to have disappeared. The least suspicion of the possibility of such a development was stifled, so to speak, by the prevalent ignorance of the most ancient Fathers, and by the blending of their works with apocryphal writings which had been altered and made to harmonize with the decisions of subsequent Councils. The Reformation, on one side, and the wonderful patristic work of edition, revision and sifting, accomplished by the great scholars of the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries, on the other, were needed to remind theologians of the fact pointed out in the 5th century by Vincent of Lerins, and to direct their attention to that fact. The fundamental argument of Protestantism against Catholic dogma charged the latter with being comparatively recent and with being unknown to Scripture and to the Fathers: *Ab initio non fuit sic.* A careful study of the doctrine of Antiquity then became necessary. In France, it was taken up with great success, by the Jesuit Petau (*De Theologicis Dogmatibus*, 1643-1650) and, a few years later, by the Oratorian Thomassin (*Theologica Dogmata*, 1680–1689). Petau still continues to be a master whom it will always be profitable to consult. At the same time, a Scotchman, John Forbes of Corse, published at Amsterdam a work, *Institutiones historico-theologicae* with the purpose of showing the harmony of the Reformed doctrine with primitive Orthodoxy; then came the work of George Bull (*Defensio Fidei Nicaenae*, 1685–1688) in which he defends, against the Socinians, the Trinitarian belief and sharply criticizes the exegesis of Petau.

However great may have been the place held in those works by the history of doctrines, still, strictly speaking, they were not histories of dogma. It is in Germany that the first essays with that title appeared, and it is chiefly Protestant Germany which has multiplied them. We may group around six names all the numerous works which have been published on this topic.

The first is that of W. Münscher of Marburg († 1814).[1] His history had been preceded by S. G. Lange's work [2] which had remained unfinished, and was followed by a series of textbooks which contributed nothing to the advance of the science itself. Notwithstanding his profound learning, Münscher himself was too much of a Rationalist to understand Christianity and its development.

After Münscher, we must mention Neander,[3] and the authors connected with Schleiermacher, among whom are Baumgarten-Crusius (†1843)[4] and F. K. Meier (†1841).[5] The tendency is already better and more conservative. Meier's book betokens, in its author, the right view of the method to be followed; the materials are well chosen and carefully arranged.

But with Hegel's rise and under the influence of his philosophy, a new conception of the evolution of dogmas was brought forward. It is represented by F. Christian Baur (†1860) and his school. Besides various essays devoted to the dogmas of the Trinity, Incarnation and Redemption, Baur wrote a text-book of the history of Dogmas and delivered lectures on the same subject.[1] Whilst, for Baumgarten-Crusius and Meier, the changes undergone by Dogma are the result of particular causes, Baur sees in these changes the effect of that general law which carries along all doctrines through the vicissitudes of the thesis, antithesis and synthesis. At one time, his system met with considerable success; now it is universally given up.

---

[1] *Handbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte*, 1797–1809; *Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte*, 1811.

[2] *Ausführliche Geschichte der Dogmen*, 1796.

[3] *Allgemeine Geschichte des Christendums*, 1825, ff.; *Dogmengeschichte*, this last work published by Jacobi in 1857; both have been translated into English.

[4] *Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte*, 1831, and ff.; *Compendium der christlichen Dogmengeschichte*, 1840 and 1846.

[5] *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, 1840.

A reaction set in, which aimed at justifying, by means of history, Orthodox Lutheranism and the fundamental dogmas of Christianity. Its most conspicuous writer was Thomasius (†1875).[2] He accepts in principle the authority of the Church and of Scripture, and thus establishes the legitimate character of the definitions of the early Councils. Nevertheless, — and this shows his inconsistency, — he proceeds in his work, still maintaining that, during the Middle Ages, the hierarchy had started doctrine in the wrong way, and that it required the Reformation to set it aright. To this same orthodox Lutheranism belong Kliefoth,[3] Schmid,[4] and Kahnis (†1888).[5]

Baur's influence was replaced by that of Ritschl (†1889). The latter wrote on the History of Dogmas only some essays on method, and a few other detached works; but he powerfully contributed to set aside the old method commonly used in text-books, of dividing the history of Dogmas into general (synthetic method) and particular (analytic method); moreover, he drew attention to the part played by Greek Philosophy in the formation of Christian Dogma. With him we may join the name of F. Nitzsch.[1]

---

[1] *Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte*, 1847; *Vorlesungen über die christlichen Dogmengeschichte*, edited in 1865–1868.

[2] *Die christliche Dogmengeschichte*, 1874–1876, re-edited by BONWETSCH and SEEBERG, 1886 and 1889.

[3] *Einleitung in die Dogmengeschichte*, 1839.

[4] *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, 1859.

[5] *Der Kirchenglaube historisch genetisch-dargestellt*, 1864.

With the members of the same school we may also, in a certain measure, associate A. Harnack.[2] The ruling idea in the latter's writings is that, "in its conception and development, Dogma is the work of the Greek mind on the field of the Gospel," in other words, that it is the product of Greek Philosophy working on the Gospel data. For the defence and proof of his thesis, the author has used to great advantage his extensive knowledge of ancient Christian Literature. For it, however, he employs a paradoxical tendency which is too manifest; many things implied in his conclusions are far from deserving acceptance. Several text-books worthy of mention, have since appeared; such as those of F. Loofs[3] and R. Seeberg.[4]

Catholic Germany has not produced as many general histories of Dogmas, but has applied herself rather to detached studies. However, we must mention the well known text-book of Klee[5] and that of Zobl, not so well known (1865). The most complete work is that of J. Schwane;[6] yet, we may find, in the historical sketches scattered by Kuhn in his *Dogmatics*,[7] remarks perhaps still deeper. Bach published, in

---

[1] *Grundriss der christlichen Dogmengeschichte*, 1870.

[2] *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1886–1890; 3rd Ed., 1893–1897. *Grundriss der Dogmengeschichte*, 1889–1891; 2nd Ed., 1893. Both works have been translated into English. — A new German edition of the *Lehrbuch* is forthcoming.

[3] *Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte*, Halle, 1889; 3rd Edit., 1893.

[4] *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, Erlangen, 1875, ff.; *Grundriss der Dogmengeschichte*, 1900.

[5] *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, 1837, ff.; translated into French by MABIRE, 1852.

[6] *Dogmengeschichte*, 1862, ff.; 2nd Edit., 1892, ff.; French translation by A. DEGERT, 1903–1904.

[7] 2nd Edit., 1859.

1873, a good history of Dogmas in the Middle Ages,[1] and K. Werner, extensive studies on St. Thomas and Scholasticism.[2]

So far France has produced no complete history of Dogmas.[3] In his controversies with Jurieu and Richard Simon,[4] Bossuet had indeed to examine the difficulties to be met with in the teaching of some Fathers; but he did so, in a spirit which seems to exclude the very idea of dogmatic progress. Some excellent suggestions are contained in the *Histoire des Sacrements* by Dom Chardon (1745); yet, we must come to Archbishop Ginoulhiac to find a work which directly and resolutely takes up the subject of which we are now speaking. His book, *Histoire du dogme catholique pendant les trois premiers siècles de l'Eglise*, was left unfinished, since it treats only of God and of the Trinity; the analysis is pushed to the extreme and the exegesis is sometimes rather timid; but the author's deep and conscientious scholarship is manifest; the exposition, clear and judicious; the tone, excellent. The *Etudes sur les Pères des trois premiers siècles* by Bishop Freppel are still read with interest and profit, though the exposition is loose and the criticism antiquated. On the other hand we cannot but value very highly the information supplied by Mgr. Duchesne in his various studies of Ecclesiastical History, particularly in his *Origines Chrétiennes*[5] and his pamphlet *Les témoins anténicéens du dogme de la Trinité* (1883). Father de Régnon has published a work on the Holy Trinity, *Etudes de théologie positive* (1892–1896), which although it remains unfinished, is one of the solid works of Historical Theology, published in recent years. To this list, we may add several writings of Mgr. Batiffol[1] and of J. Turmel,[2] as well as many articles in the *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* undertaken by A. Vacant.

---

[1] *Die Dogmengeschichte des katholischen Mittelalters*, 1873–1875.

[2] *Thomas von Aquino*, 1859; *Die Scholastik des späteren Mittelalters*, 1881 and foll.

[3] I am speaking only of Catholics. Protestants have published some works in that line. The best known is that of Fr. Bonifas, *Histoire des dogmes de l'Eglise Chrétienne*, 1889.

[4] *Avertissements aux protestants; Défense de la Tradition.*

[5] Cf. also his *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*, 1906–1910 (First vol. translated into English, 1909).

In Italy, the lectures of J. Semeria, a Barnabite, on Christian Origins deserve mention.[3]

England applied herself to the history of Dogmas more slowly than Germany. But, in 1845, a book appeared that was destined to mark an epoch; it was the *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* by John Henry Newman. The work is not a history of Dogmas, but rather its introduction or preface, full of deep views and original presentations. The author became a Catholic, before he had finished it. English-speaking Protestants have since published comparatively few histories of Dogma; they have chiefly translated those published in Germany. However, we may mention that of Shedd (†1894),[4] written from the Calvinistic standpoint, the moderate and well informed summary of G. P. Fisher (†1909),[5] and more recently the judicious *Introduction* of J. F. Bethune-Baker.[6]

---

[1] *Etudes d'Histoire et de Théologie positive*, 1st and 2nd series, Paris, 1904–5 and foll.

[2] *Histoire de la Théologie Positive*, Paris, 1904–1906.

[3] More particularly *Dogma, gerarchia e culto nella chiesa primitiva*, Roma, 1902; French translation by F. Richermoz, Paris, 1906.

[4] *History of Christian Doctrihe*, 8th Ed., New York, 1884.

[5] *History of Christian Doctrine*, New York, 1896.

[6] *An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine to the Time of the Council of Chalcedon*, London, 1903.

CHAPTER I

ON THE RELIGIOUS, PHILOSOPHICAL AND MORAL DOCTRINES, IN THE MIDST OF WHICH CHRISTIAN DOGMA APPEARED AND BEGAN ITS DEVELOPMENT

The preaching of Jesus and of the Apostles — the immediate source of Christian Dogma — did not address itself to a world recently come into existence, nor indeed did it, even in the beginning, fall upon minds devoid of ideas. In Palestine, where it was first received, and in the Greco-Roman world, where it spread afterwards, doctrines and systems were prevalent, and institutions and customs had been existing, some for a longer, others for a shorter time. With these the new teaching very soon found itself in contact. Even those who adopted it and made it widely known, had been trained, in their childhood, according to those customs and doctrines, and brought up in the midst of those institutions. Hence it is natural to suppose that they introduced something thereof, into their notions and formulas of Christianity. A history of Dogma must then begin with a sketch of the ideas and systems which were prevalent both among the Jews and in the Greco-Roman world from the time of Christ's coming until the middle of the 2nd century. Such a sketch is necessary that we may realize the influence which those elements exercised or may have exercised on the formation and early expression of Christian Doctrine.

§ 1. Greco-Roman Religion and Philosophy at the time of Christ and until the Middle of the Second Century.[1]

At the time of Christ's coming into the world, a religious revival was going on in the Greco-Roman world: which, though making stronger the attachment to official rites, was at the same time raising in the souls of men aspirations towards forms of worship more personal and, as they thought, more efficacious than were the ceremonies of old. This revival was, partly, the work of Augustus (30 B. C.–14 A. D.), anxious to shelter his power behind the respect which the traditions of the past always inspire. It was likewise, and in fact, chiefly the result of the new circumstances in which society was at that time; the barriers separating various peoples were disappearing, nationalities more and more intermingled, orders and classes among citizens were passing away; with the growth of absolutism, liberty was on the decrease, wealth was becoming uncertain and life itself was conscious of insecurity. Most of the commons were poor and starving; whilst the affluent had so much abused their riches for the sake of pleasure, that, finally disgusted, they were nearly craving for an outside power to come and draw them far away from the gratifications they were unable to give up. On the other hand, Philosophy, which had been unpopular at Rome until Cicero's time (†43 B. C.), had won the right of citizenship and was setting forth more severe teachings. The religions of the East, gradually advancing towards the West, were rousing everywhere an intense religious feeling, were opening before pious souls new horizons and presenting practices and emotions which, though disturbing, corresponded to needs deeply felt, the more deeply that they were less well defined.

---

[1] Cf. G. Boissier, *La religion romaine d'Auguste aux Antonins*, 4th Ed., Paris, 1892; C. Martha, *Les moralistes sous l'empire romain*, 5th Ed., Paris, 1886; Réville, *La religion à Rome sous les Sévères*, Paris, 1886; Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire before* 170, London, 1893; Hatch, *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church*, 7th Ed., London, 1898; Marquardt, *Romische Staatsverwaltung*, vol. 3, *Das Sacralwesen*, Leipsic, 1878; Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, part 3, 3rd Ed., Leipsic, 1881, — at least partly translated into English; Luthardt, *Die antike Ethik*, Leipsic, 1887; A. Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrunderten*, Leipsic, 1902 — translated into English under the title: *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity*, 2 volumes, 2nd Ed., 1908.

A first result of this state of things was a kind of religious syncretism which tended to blend into one all national religions, to identify the pantheons of the conquered nations with that of the victors, even to represent all the various Gods as so many personified attributes of one god, or so many manifestations of the universal plastic power which permeated and ruled the world. This last conception was accepted by the learned, and though the common people remained faithful to polytheism and to the worship of separate divinities, still they were not altogether opposed to it. Besides, the Ancients were very far from having of the Gods the idea of transcendence which we have of the only God, nor did they use the word *θεός* in the restricted and exclusive meaning which we now attach to it.[1] The divine essence was considered as one, and at the same time as divisible and communicable; of it were made the Gods of mythology, happy and immortal, as well as the souls of heroes and of the men renowned for virtue; there was in these a *genius*, which was to survive them and, after their death, be definitely ranged among the Gods. Hence we should not wonder at seeing the apotheosis bestowed first on great ancestors, then on the most influential men, and finally, in a spirit of flattery, on all emperors. Nay, it was thought, in every family, that the departed members had reascended to the Gods from whom they had come. To minds imbued with such beliefs, the idea of the apparition of the Gods upon earth did not seem preposterous. Far from it: although, at the beginning, such an idea had been opposed by the freethinkers of the time. Gradually it had been progressing and at the epoch of the Antonines, had forced itself upon most of its former adversaries. Consequently the immortality of the soul was a doctrine then generally received, except by the Epicureans. After leaving the body, the soul was judged. If it had practised justice, it was associated with the Gods; if it had been wicked, it was punished with the wicked; so that either Elysium or Tartarus awaited it. However, they at times imagined a third abode for some guilty ones whose faults were to be ascribed more to misfortune than to perversity. But, setting aside the old data of mythology, nothing certain and precise was known as to the nature of future happiness or torments. By bringing in the idea of metempsychosis, the doctrine of Pythagoras had somewhat obscured and unsettled the ancient traditions as to the everlasting duration of Elysian felicity. And of that felicity, Virgil, as a faithful echo of the beliefs current in his time, has left us two descriptions which, though coming one after the other, do not agree. In one of them, the happiness of heroes and just men is complete and eternal: such was the common conception. In the other, there appears the thought of expiation: all souls, even those of the just, must expiate, for a thousand years, in a way more or less painful, the sins they may have committed during their life upon earth; after this, they drink oblivion at the River Lethe, and are sent back into the world, there to begin another existence; such was the Pythagorean concept, which placed itself by the side of the earlier concept, without however destroying it.

---

[1] Clement of Alex., *Stromat.*, VI, 14, *P. G.*, IX, 337; Origen, *Prolegom. in Psalm.*, in Pitra, *Analecta*, II, 437; Cicero, *De Legibus*, II, 11: "Omnium quidem animos immortales esse, sed fortiorum bonorumque divinos." Cf. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, I, p. 119, note 2.

These were the principal doctrinal elements that made up classical Paganism, under Augustus and for a few years after. Of course, they were scanty; hence though they could suffice as a foundation for an official worship, they came short of quenching that thirst for certitude and for mystical emotions, which more and more tormented certain souls. Instead of turning to these ancient forms, the religious spirit, which the Emperor had done his utmost to arouse, addressed itself to worships, old, indeed, in themselves, but new for that society, coming, as they did, from foreign lands. Not that Oriental religions proposed a theoretical teaching more complete and certain than others; but they pretended to purify man from his sins and, by means of mysterious initiations and practices up to that time unknown to the Roman world, to bring him into a close communion with the Divinity. Now, notwithstanding its frightful corruption, Greco-Roman society seems to have felt deeply the need of expiation and yearned for intercourse with Heaven. Hence the age saw many, chiefly among the women, won over by the gravity and austere life, as well as by the preachings, of the priests of Isis or of the Syrian goddess, witnessed them fast most rigorously, bathe in icy water, abstain from foods considered unclean, inflict on themselves penances and macerations, and make ready for the festivals of the Gods, by observing severe continence. Then, on more solemn occasions, a ceremony of great importance was gone through: — the *taurobolium*, the expiatory sacrifice by excellence, in which the blood of the victim was to purify from their faults, and "regenerate for eternity" those on whom it flowed.[1] These practices were accompanied or followed by initiations, in which, as they thought, the future life was revealed, and the god showed to those being initiated the mysterious side of his nature. Of all these worships, that of Mithra was, after the rule of the Antonines, to become the most popular. It made its first appearance in Rome towards the end of the Republic. Mithra is a mediator and a redeemer, having a hierarchy, sacrifice, baptism and a sacred supper, in which the initiated brother eats a piece of bread and drinks from a chalice of water.[1] In this the Fathers will see a diabolical counterfeit of Christianity.[2] Still, what the Pagan soul seeks after in all these ceremonies is the very same thing the Christian soul shall find in the Gospel and its institutions, viz., forgiveness of sins committed, purification, not legal and ritual, but true and interior, salvation, eternal life.

---

[1] *Taurobolio criobolioque in aeternum renatus* (*Corpus inscript. latin.*, VI, 510). The first mention of the *taurobolium* is found in an inscription of Naples, of the year 133 A. D.

There were, then, endeavors to make closer the bond between religion and individual morality. In consequence, the former ceased to be a mere State institution of which the priests were the functionaries, and public decency, the standard; on the contrary, it began to be considered the embodiment of personal feelings, whence all were to derive the courage needed to reform their conduct and check their passions. Yet, it should not be forgotten that, in this work of renovation, religious sentiment, especially among the learned, was powerfully helped by Philosophy.

True, in its metaphysical teaching, the latter had for many years completely lost its prestige. Each one of the great schools, that of Pythagoras, of Plato, of Aristotle, of Epicurus, of Zeno, still numbered some representatives; but they were much more characterized by the dominant than by the exclusive element of their system. More and more frequent reconciliations and concessions tended to do away with disagreements and to melt into one the various theories about God and the world. With Arcesilaus († 240 B. C.), the Academy had already combined with Pyrrhonism; it persevered in the theory of the *probable* with Carneades († 129 B. C.), with Philo of Larissa († about 80 B. C.), who was Cicero's teacher, with Antiochus of Ascalon († 68 B. C), and with Cicero himself († 43 B. C.). Still it was chiefly with Stoicism that it allied itself. Now the Metaphysics of the Porch was very simple. There are no pure spirits: all things are bodies, some more, others less refined. The mind, which is a body of a rather delicate nature, is identical with God who, just like a subtle fire, an eternal ether, an immanent and hidden force diffused into the world, permeates and moves and rules it, and is its very *soul.* From God came matter, which, after clothing Him as with a garment, must again be absorbed into Him. From Him also are derived all the forces of nature, even the very spirit of man.[1] He is, in the world, the principle of all activity or energy, not in the sense that He imparts it and creates it from the outside; it is He Himself or, in the strict sense of the word, it emanates from Him. He is, then, by way of preëminence, the λόγος σπερματικός, the seminal reason of the universe: a universe, which He governs by immutable laws, by laws proper to Himself; for He is identical with Fate and the fatal order of the world, though at the same time He is reasonable, perfect, exempt from all evil, and the author of all good things.[2]

---

[1] Justin, I *Apol.*, 6, Otto, I, 182.

[2] Justin, *ibid.*; *Dialog. with Trypho*, 70, Otto, II, 250, foll.

At first sight, this materialistic Pantheism and this conception of an immanent God seems far remote, indeed, from Plato's transcendent idea of God and from the contrast he had established between God and nature, chiefly between God and matter. Still, in Plato's doctrine, there was an element of reconciliation. He believed in a soul of the world, from which had sprung the souls of the stars and these, being divided, had formed, in their turn, the souls of men and of brutes.[3] Into that soul of the world, the divine νοῦς, the Mind was inserted; which though inferior to the idea of Good, which was God Himself, surpassed the soul in excellence.[1] Now we see that even Plato's nephew, Speusippus, identified the divine Intelligence with the soul of the world, whilst some Stoics, like Boethus (about 150 B. C.), considered God, not as immanent, but as external, to the world He governs.[2] On the other hand, we meet with some Peripatetics of the first century B. C., such as the author of the Περὶ κόσμου, who distinguish between God and His power (δύναμις), and represent the latter as permeating the world, just as, according to the Stoics, God permeates and animates it.[3] — We find a similar syncretic tendency on the part of the Pythagoreans. The truth is that Philosophy withdrew more and more from pure speculation, in order to concentrate all its attention on Ethics; and in this direction its contact with the Western and Roman mind gave it a new impetus.

---

[1] Ἐξαποστελλομέναι δυνάμεις ὡς ἀπό τινος πηγῆς. Cf. ZELLER, *Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics*, p. 146, n. 3.

[2] Cf. ZELLER, p. 150, n. 1.

[3] FOUILLÉE, *La Philosophie de Platon*, II, 203, 204.

This turn in Philosophy from the abstract to the concrete caused all systems, even those which, like Stoicism and Epicureanism, seemed the most opposed, to meet on practical ground. Of them Stoicism was certainly the most influential. From it many drew their inspirations, even some whose metaphysical ideas should have driven them far in another direction. Thus, for instance, Lucretius (98–54 B. C.) sets forth lessons of virtue altogether unexpected from him. Cicero also, whose sympathies were for Platonism, prefers the ethical system of Zeno and of the Porch. The same code of morals we find, tempered, and therefore more pure and complete, in Seneca (3 B. C.–65 A. D.), most probably the best philosopher Rome ever produced; hard and austere, in Epictetus (40?–117? A. D.), meditative and retired within itself, in Marcus Aurelius (121–180).

However, when it comes to speak of our duties to God, this code of morals uses a language quite different from that of speculative Stoicism. In the latter, God is the divine energy animating the world, nay, He is the world itself, He is Nature, Destiny, Fortune. But when it is question of precepts of morality, the same God becomes a living being, — a person, — and is represented as a judge, a providence, a father: *Prope est a te Deus, tecum est, intus est. . . . Sacer intra nos spiritus sedet malorum bonorumque nostrorum observator et custos . . . ipse nos tractat.*[1] — *Deus ad homines venit, immo quod est propius, in homines venit; nulla sine Deo mens bona est.*[2] — *More optimorum parentum qui maledictis suorum infantium adrident, non cessant di beneficia congerere . . . unam potentiam sortiti, prodesse.*[3] Hence the first of all virtues is to give oneself up to God, to accept His will without a murmur, for He is a friend, a father who loves us with an intense love: whom we also ought to love and thank for His benefits. Moreover, as He listens to our prayers and is sensible of our miseries, we ought to pray to Him. Such are the words and advice of Seneca, who, however, when speculation gets the upper hand, does not scruple to place his ideal wise man on the same level with God, even to declare him superior, in a certain measure, to the latter,[4] and emphatically to affirm that the wise man has nothing to ask or fear from God.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 195, 112, 164. [2] Cf. ZELLER, p. 159. [3] Cf. ZELLER, p. 148.

Yet, at the same time, Seneca recommends, as to oneself, a discreet austerity which, whilst avoiding, in the exterior, anything savoring of singularity, keeps up the soul's vigor and energy. Wealth is to be used with moderation; voluntary abstinences, to be practised, so that the body may be held in subjection; honors and dignities, to be despised as things that do not make us better; excessive emotions of passion, to be repressed. Still, there are emotions which cannot be checked and must be allowed, such as sorrow and tears, at the sight of a great loss. Yet, let it be remembered that the body is the prison of the soul, which it oppresses and constrains, and therefore that the latter must always oppose the appetites of the former, and even be strong enough to free itself in case of necessity.

---

[1] *Epist.* XLI, 2.

[2] *Epist.* LXXIII, 16.

[3] *De beneficiis*, VII, 31, 4.

[4] *Epist.* LIII, 11.

But what is, perhaps, the most striking in this new code of morals is the idea, that it proclaims, of universal brotherhood among men, the idea of a love, we may say of a charity which must embrace all. In this we witness the crumbling down of barriers, whose fall will gradually modify the social relations of men. Seneca not only asks that we should be liberal and beneficent, feed the hungry, help the wanderers and the poor, redeem slaves, and decently bury the corpses of criminals; he even wishes that no distinction be made in the bestowing of favors, that even slaves be considered our neighbors, and our very enemies, not excluded from our benefits: *Hominibus prodesse natura me iubet, et servi liberine sunt hi, ingenui et libertini . . . quid refert? Ubicumque homo est, ibi beneficii locus est.*[1] — *Si deos . . . imitaris, da et ingratis beneficia, nam et sceleratis sol oritur.*[2]

These are noble teachings, indeed, and it is no wonder that, since the 4th century, many Christians thought that Seneca had received them from St. Paul.[3] However, if we go to the bottom of his philosophy and consider all its affirmations, we find that, after all, it does not agree so well with the commands and chiefly with the spirit of the Gospel. Let it be remarked, too, that, in opposition to what is generally thought, these same lessons were not presented to the aristocracy alone; side by side with the philosophers who, like Cicero, Seneca, or Cornutus wrote and spoke for the Patricians, there were preaching philosophers, like Papirius Fabianus and later on Dio Chrysostomus (about 30–116), who, leading the life of the common people, spoke to them in theatres and from street-corners, thus initiating them, as much as possible, into these wholesome doctrines.

---

[1] *De vita beata*, 24.

[2] *De beneficiis*, VII, 26, 1.

[3] The opinion according to which Seneca was in communication with St. Paul, is groundless.

The summary we have just given refers to Pagan Philosophy and Ethics at the time of the Apostolic preaching. But, as we advance towards the end of the 1st century, and chiefly during the 2nd, we see this philosophy assuming a more and more religious character, blending itself more and more closely with religion, until, with Neoplatonism, it loses itself in mysticism and contemplation. Thus, in Epictetus, we are no longer told to live, as Stoics would say, in keeping with the dictates of nature (*secundum naturam suam vivere;* — *sequere naturam*); but we are told to conform "to the law of God," to have God continually before our eyes, in order to adore Him and pray to Him and acknowledge His supreme authority. Marcus Aurelius is a devout man who omits no Pagan sacrifice and welcomes all religions.

Besides, Stoicism does its utmost to give of mythology an explanation at the same time reasonable and in harmony with its own principles. Jupiter becomes the soul of the world, the primitive fire or ether; the Gods are mere personifications of the energies that have emanated from him. The most obscene fables are represented as so many ways to describe natural phenomena; oracles and haruspices are approved. Plutarch of Chæronea (about 50–138) framed a system, which was later on vulgarized by Apuleius (about 120–195) among the Romans and which accounted for all the beliefs of Polytheism and justified its practices. Between the Supreme God (*ὄντως ὄν*) and the world, the demons or genii come and go, some of whom are good and the organs of Providence and of divine revelations; others, wicked, whimsical, light and the authors of all the blunders and crimes ascribed to gods by mythology. Still, Apuleius continues, to acknowledge their benefits or turn away their wrath, we must honor all of them and pay to every one of them the worship he demands and in the way in which he demands it. Whilst Stoicism and Platonism draw nearer and nearer to popular religion, a new Pythagorism comes, in its turn, to urge on souls to the ways of asceticism and renunciation. Sextius of Rome, who lived a short while after Cicero, had already recommended abstinence from meat: a recommendation which was renewed by Sotion (1st century P. C.). The ancient legend of Pythagoras captivated again men's attention. His disciples extolled continence and celibacy, imposed purifications and baptisms, and made distinctions between this and that kind of food; at the same time, they applied themselves to occult sciences and ascribed to numbers a secret influence. And with this, we are brought in contact not only with the mysteries of oriental religions, but also with gymnosophy and magic.

Such, then, was the religious, philosophical and moral state of the Pagan world of Rome and Greece, at the time which witnessed the preaching of the Gospel and the foundation of the Church. I have recorded only the features in which Paganism was somewhat similar to the new teaching, and moved forward, so to speak, to meet it. To sum up: the state of the Pagan world can be expressed in the words: there was confusion and uncertainty, and at the same time eagerness for certainty and light. Metaphysics, the basis of all the rest, was wavering; doubts prevailed as to the essence of God, the nature and future existence of the soul and hence the moral aphorisms, which the sound reason of a Cicero or a Seneca had found out, lost, in a great measure, their power. And yet, a great many souls were anxious to get settled and for that purpose addressed themselves to any help they thought they could find around: to mysteries, dreams, magic. However, above all that confusion of thoughts, one thing stood, revered by all, the political unity and powerful organization of the Empire. If, later on, that unity became a danger for Christianity, since it marshalled against it the strongest and most extensive administration that the world has ever seen, still, at the beginning it procured for its expansion a wonderful facility, whilst it offered at the same time an admirable model of the cohesion which was to be found in the Church. Then, too, the right to found, in that immense body politic, colleges and private associations of a character more or less religious, allowed the followers of the new religion to place themselves within the domain of law, there to find more than once a refuge in case of persecution.

§ 2. Religious and Moral Doctrines of the Jews at the time of the Coming of Jesus. Palestinian Judaism.

After the death of Alexander the Great (323 B. C.), and even soon after the Babylonian Captivity, the Jews began to form two groups quite distinct: the *Palestinian group*, made up of those who dwelt in the land of their ancestors and were immediately connected with Jerusalem and the Temple; and the group of the *Dispersion* (*Diaspora*), whose representatives, after first inhabiting the territory near the Euphrates, spread all over the Hellenic countries, and established themselves chiefly at Alexandria, and then, after the Roman conquest, could be found in large numbers in the Latin countries and at Rome. From our standpoint, these two groups present features quite different; hence we will study each of them separately.[1]

---

[1] The reader will find in W. BOUSSET, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (Berlin, 1903, pp. 49, ff.), the list of the principal works on that question. We will mention here only the most recent and important: WELLHAUSEN, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 4th Ed., 1901; SCHÜRER, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 3rd Ed., Leipsic, 1898–

If we start with the end of the Captivity (537 B. C.), we may divide into five periods the history of the Jewish People in Palestine: (1) The *Persian* period which extends to 330, when Alexander conquers the land; (2) the *Greek* period from 330 to 165; (3) at this last date, the religious and patriotic spirit of the Jews rises against the tyranny and persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, and the Maccabees win back for their country a semi-independence which lasts for one century (165–63): this was the *Asmonean* period; (4) but dissension breaks out between the Asmonean princes, Hyrcanus and Aristobulus; called by the latter, Pompey conquers Jerusalem (63 B. C.) and leaves Hyrcanus as ethnarch under the supremacy of Rome: hence this may be called the *Roman* period; (5) it lasted until the year 37 B. C., when the son of Antipater, Herod, was acknowledged king by the Romans and founded the dynasty named after him (37 B. C.–100 A. D.).

During these six centuries, the Jews of Palestine came successively in contact with the civilization of Persia and with that of Greece. The former certainly influenced them: still, it has been acknowledged that, from the point of view which we are now considering, that influence can be detected only in the three domains of angelology, demonology, and eschatology, and that, even as to these points, Judaism has not precisely borrowed foreign doctrines, but rather quickened and developed its own doctrinal germs; so that Jewish characteristics and peculiarities were but little affected by their contact with Persia. Far more dreadful was that of Greece; for

1901 (English translation from the 2nd German Edit., New York, 1891); A. SCHLATTER, *Israels Geschichte von Alexander dem Grossen bis Hadrian*, Stuttgard, 1901; HOLTZMANN, *Lehrbuch des neutestamenlichen Theologie*, Friburg in Brisgau, 1897; DALMAN, *Die Worte Jesu*, Leipsic, 1898 (English translation, 1902); J. VERNES, *Histoire des Idées messianiques depuis Alexandre jusqu'à l'empereur Hadrien*, Paris, 1874; DRUMMOND, *The Jewish Messiah*, 1877; R. H. CHARLES, *A Critical History of the doctrine of a future life in Israel, in Judaism and in Christianity*, London, 1899. Several articles of the *Revue Biblique* and of various recent Bible Dictionaries may be consulted also with profit.

Hellenism had a far greater power of expansion and penetration than Persian civilization ever possessed. For three centuries and a half before Christ, it encompassed the Jews, settled in their very midst and forced them, in spite of themselves, to enter with it into constant relations. They had to make their choice, between departing from their country and giving up all social life, or becoming hellenized, at least in a certain measure. But the more the bulk of the nation felt invaded, in its external and public life, by foreign influence, the more it strove, with an intense and jealous intolerance, to guard its religious life against that influence, and to keep intact its beliefs and worship, its practices and customs, its privilege of being a race chosen by God and separated from the Gentiles. In the course of time, the letter of the Law was more and more closely adhered to; then it was that interpreters, scribes and scholiasts of every description had their day of triumph. As relations with the Heathen gave rise to many difficulties about the meaning of legal enactments, a casuistry voluminous in size, narrow and formalistic in spirit, endeavored to give them a solution and, in case of need, to complete the Law. This became and was later on called the *Halakha*, the tradition which passes on from one generation to another. At the same time, and in order to quicken patriotic and religious hopes, scribes commented on the historical and prophetical parts of the Sacred Books; they explained the moral precepts contained in the gnomical books, and carefully gathered the more or less legendary traditions and narratives with which imagination had adorned the history of Israel. Thus was formed the *Agadah* or *Haggadah* which is the subject of the *Midraschim* and makes up more than the third of the Babylonian Talmud.

Most assuredly these collections contain quite valuable information which may help us to get a precise knowledge of the times which immediately preceded the coming of Jesus; but sometimes it is rather difficult, nay impossible, to clear up that information and profit by it, for lack of chronological data. Hence it is by perusing chiefly the Judæo-Palestinian literature of that time, *i. e.*, the writings composed from 200 B. C. to 100 A. D., most of which are in the Agadah, that we can draw the picture of the religious and moral doctrines of the Palestinian Jews at that time.

These writings are of two kinds: the canonical and the apocryphal books. Among the former, which are better known, we must mention the Maccabean Psalms which cannot always be discerned with certainty, Ecclesiasticus, the first book of the Maccabees, those of Judith and Tobias, and perhaps, according to many scholars, the book of Daniel. Among the Apocryphal books, the principal are (1) *The Book of Henoch*, whose chapters I–XXXVI and LXXII–CV go back to 133–100 B. C., whilst chapters XXXVII–LXXI are not older than the year 37 B. C. The fragments relating to Noe, that are interpolated in chapters XXXVII–LXXI, and include moreover chapters CVI and CVII, are still more recent, though it is impossible to assign their date. (2) *The Eighteen Psalms of Solomon* (shortly after 63 B. C.). (3) *The Assumption of Moses* (first years of the Christian era). (4) *The Fourth Book of Esdras* (81–96 A. D.). (5) *The Book of Jubilees* (1st century of Christian era). (6) *The Apocalypse of Baruch* (70 A. D.–150). (7) *The Book of the Secrets of Henoch*, at the latest at the end of the 1st century, or in the first years of the 2nd. (8) *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, interpolated by Christians at the end of the 1st or at the beginning of the 2nd century. (9) *The Apocalypse of Abraham*, earlier than the middle of the 2nd century. (10) *The Paralipomena of Jeremias*, interpolated during the 2nd century, though its substance is more ancient. (11) *The Martyrdom of Isaias*, a composite work of which the precise age cannot be determined.[1]

---

[1] There is necessarily a certain diversity of opinion among scholars as to the dates to which those writings should be ascribed; I have mentioned the

What stands out most prominently in this literature, is, above all, the monotheistic character of the nation we are studying. There was a time when they were strongly inclined to idolatry; but, after the exile, such a tendency is replaced by abhorrence for everything that pertains to Paganism. At the same time, the transcendent character of the Deity is more explicitly held; His name, always ineffable, is superseded by equivalents, all of which proclaim His greatness and sovereignty; the expression "Father" is comparatively rare. Anthropomorphisms are explained and softened; divine attributes are more distinctly analyzed. Among these, *sanctity* is insisted upon, inasmuch as it implies the separation from any kind of impurity, physical or moral; a doctrine whose consequences are seen in the eschatological beliefs about the last purifications.

Is there, at this epoch and in these Palestinian surroundings any trace of a trinitarian doctrine, at least in germ? — Perhaps in germ, but as yet, certainly very obscure. As to the Holy Ghost, it does not seem that the ideas about His existence or nature were more perfect than those to be found in more ancient books. The Spirit of God is mentioned rather seldom; and when He is mentioned, it looks as a faint echo of what we read in the previous literature. In regard to the Word, it cannot be denied that the tendency, already manifest in *Proverbs* (8, 9), to make a person of God's wisdom,

dates given by SCHÜRER, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, vol. 3 (English Transl., vol. 3), who supplies more details about the origin and editions of those works. For the *Book of Henoch*, the edition of J. FLEMMING and L. RADERMACHER, *Das Buch Enoch*, Leipsic, 1901, should be consulted. More of those apocryphal books may be found in the translation of KAUTZSCH, *Die Apocryphen und Pseudepigraphen des alten Testaments*, vol. 2, Leipsic, 1900. Moreover, we know that, besides those which have been preserved, there were also in circulation many other writings of the same kind that have either completely or nearly altogether perished. Among others, we may mention a *Prayer of Joseph*, fragments of which are quoted by Origen (*In Ioan.*, vol. II, cap. 25; Lommatzsch, I, 147).

is found likewise in *Ecclesiasticus* (1, 24). The first-born of God, created before all ages, that wisdom has assisted God in the creation and organization of the world; it has, then, a part in nature and in the moral life also; by it all virtues are inspired and from it all good life proceeds (24, *passim*). That personification may be found also in the two works ascribed to Henoch.[1]

On the other hand the Jews had long been wont to consider the Word, i. e., the "Logos" of God, as a power emanating of course from Him, but still having its own existence. That conception, which appears in the *Apocalypse of Baruch* (56^4) and in the *Fourth Book of Esdras* (6^{43}) made the explanation of Biblical anthropomorphisms easy, by attributing to an intermediary being whatever might be offensive in them, and we see that such a conception was frequently used by the Targums — of which the redaction was finished only in the 4th century, although the elements are more ancient. In them the Memrâ (word) takes God's place, every time a work *ad extra* is referred to: creation, manifestation, revelation.

However, had we no further teachings, we might regard such a manner of speaking as nothing but a bold prosopopeia, and the reason why, in these passages, we should not take the words too literally, is that other attributes of God had been already the object of similar, though less precise personifications; for instance His glory,[2] His name,[3] His face.[4] The Schekinâ (God's glory) plays in the Talmud the same part as the Memrâ does in the Targums; in the Mischna, composed about 200 A. D., the immediate subject of theophanies is the Metatrôn (μετάθρονος ?), the first of spirits, though we cannot determine at what precise time these conceptions were first framed.

---

[1] *Henoch*, XLII, 1, 2, etc.; *Book of the Secrets of Henoch*, XXX, 8, and XXXIII, 4 (recension A).

[2] *Exod.*, 24^{16-17}, 23^{18-22}; *Isaias*, 40^5; *Ezech.*, 3^{23}, etc.

[3] *Isaias*, 59^{19}; *Ps.* 101^{16}; *Exod.*, 23^{21}, etc.

[4] *Exod.*, 33^{14}; *Deuter.*, 4^{37}; *Lament.*, 4^{16}.

But an important idea appearing then is that of the preëxistence of some more considerable persons or objects which are only manifested and externally revealed (φανεροῦσθαι), when they appear in the world. Of course, every thing is always present to God, whose eternity knows neither past nor future, and in this sense, it is true that everything preëxists in the knowledge He has of it. However, it seems that a greater privilege was granted to those who were to approach Him most closely and to become, once in the world, the subject of His predilection or the instrument of His designs, nay to objects and institutions referring to His worship. It was a preëxistence whose nature, whether merely ideal or objective and concrete, was not rigorously defined, though it was certainly not ascribed to all beings indiscriminately.[1] Perhaps that idea had its foundation in Exodus, 25^{40}: *Inspice et fac secundum exemplar quod tibi in monte monstratum est.* Anyhow, this much is certain: that at the time of which we are speaking, we find that notion applied to Jerusalem, to the Temple, to the Law, and also to some personages, Moses, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.[2] We shall see that it was applied, quite naturally indeed, to the Messias.

Then, this doctrine is in perfect harmony with the doctrine of God creator of the universe, a doctrine which the Jewish conscience energetically maintains (*Eccli.*, 1^8). The first objects of that creation are the angels. During the post-exilian age, angelology made great progress among the Jews. At the time of which we are speaking, that development is scarcely noticeable in the Canonical books; such is not the case in the Apocryphal works; here imagination was given free scope. Angels, very many in number, are the intermediaries of divine communications. They have a hierarchy and leaders; seven among them are constantly standing before God. The principal of them are known, Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, Uriel.[1] They are set over the various countries and oppose the hostile powers; they are also in charge of the elements.[2] Still, all the Angels did not remain faithful to God. A belief quite popular connects the fall of those who revolted, with the narrative of Genesis, 6^{2-4}: impurity was the cause of their ruin.[3] These fallen Angels also have leaders, about whose names traditions are rather confused, — Azazel, Semiaza, Mastema or Satan, Beliar.[4] Though they are bound in hell, still they prompt us to evil; however, such a part is left chiefly to those who were born of them, viz., to the demons.[5]

---

[1] DALMAN (*Die Worte Jesu*, 245; English transl., pp. 299, f.), denies, however, that it was then a principle of Jewish Philosophy.

[2] *Apoc. of Baruch*, 4^3; *Midrasch Bereschith rabba*, 8^2; *Assumpt. of Moses*, 1^{14}; *Prayer of Joseph*, in Origen, *In Ioan.*, II, 25 (Lomm., I, 147).

After the Angels, man comes under our consideration. The Jewish doctrine about his nature had always been short and concrete enough, and it was such, at the time of Jesus. It was known only that in him there are two elements and that he does not perish altogether with death. What engrossed far more the attention of the Jew, was the situation resulting for him from his inclination to evil, on the one hand, and the help to be derived from the observance of the Law, on the other. Many passages show us that St. Paul was not the first to reflect on these problems and ask himself which is the part of man and that of God, in the work of salvation. Man's weakness was deeply felt, the universality of sin, acknowledged without hesitation.[1] That weakness was represented as a heritage from Adam, together with death itself: *O tu quid fecisti, Adam? Si enim tu peccasti, non est factum solius tuus casus, sed et nostrum qui ex te advenimus* (4 *Esd.*, 7^{118}).[2] In this passage, as it is easy to see, the author nearly expresses the doctrine of original sin. The consequence he draws therefrom is that it would have been better for man never to be born, and that far more happy are brutes which fear neither judgment nor torment after death ($7^{116-126}$; $^{65-69}$). However, the loss of the reward is not a fatal one; and each one of us, after all, remains the arbiter of his own destiny; Adam acted only for himself, each one of us is the Adam of his own soul.[3] What then is to be done? To observe the Law; for it is by his works that man is saved.[4] But we know how burdensome and complex that Law has become at the hands of Jewish casuists, how narrow the road to salvation seemed to be, and therefore, whilst the pious and sincere Jew unhesitatingly believed that most men would be lost, he would multiply his penances and austerities, and in conclusion appeal to God's mercy, as the only resource which was left him in that extremity: *In hoc enim adnuntiabitur iustitia tua et bonitas tua, Domine, cum misertus fueris eis qui non habent substantiam operum bonorum* (4 *Esd.*, 8^{36}); for he felt crushed between his inability to observe the whole Law, and that Law which remained inflexible before his weakness: *Nos quidem qui legem accepimus peccantes peribimus, et cor nostrum quod suscepit*

---

[1] *Tobias*, 12^{15}; *Dan.*, 10^{13}, 8^{16}; *Henoch*, 9^{1}; 4 *Esdr.*, 5^{20}.

[2] *Daniel*, $10^{13, 20, 21}$, 12^{1}; *Jub.*, 2^{3}.

[3] *Jub.*, 5^{5-11}; *Henoch*, 6–16; *Apoc. of Baruch*, $56^{12, 13}$.

[4] *Henoch*, 8^{1}, 9^{6}, 6^{7}; *Jub.*, 10^{8}, 17^{16}, 10^{11}; *Testam. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Simeon ^{5}, Levi ^{19}, etc.

[5] *Henoch*, 15^{8}–16^{4}; *Jub.*, 10^{1}, foll. Cf. HACKSPILL, in the *Revue Biblique*, 1902, pp. 527, foll.

---

[1] *Quis enim est de praesentibus qui non peccavit, vel quis natorum qui non praeterivit sponsionem tuam?* (4 *Esd.*, $7^{46, 48}$; *Henoch*, 15^4; *Apoc. of Baruch*, 48^{42-46}).

[2] Cf. 4 *Esd.*, $3^{21, 22}$; *Apoc. of Bar.*, 33^4, 48^{42}.

[3] *Non est ergo Adam causa nisi animae suae tantum, nos vero unusquisque fuit animae suae Adam.* (*Apoc. of Bar.*, 54^{19}). Cf. 4 *Esd.*, 8^{56}.

[4] *Tobias*, 1^{1-12}; 4 *Esd.*, $7^{20-24, 72}$; *Apoc. of Baruch*, 51^7. Still faith is necessary; it is placed side by side with works, nay on the same level (*Henoch*, 46^7, $63^{5, 7}$; 4 *Esd.*, 13^{23}, 9^7).

eam; nam lex non perit, sed permanet in suo honore (4 *Esd.*, 9^{36-37}; cf. $^{28-37}$). Do not these words remind us of St. Paul (*Rom.*, 7)?

What will become of men after death? In the well known passage, 12^{1-3}, Daniel had already spoken of the resurrection which awaited, on the last day, the good and the wicked among his people; the former, to be rewarded; the latter, punished. But in this passage, the allusion is only to the last judgment. On the other hand, Josephus tells us (*De bello iud.*, II, 8, 11), that, according to the Essenes, souls are, forever, immediately after death, happy or unhappy: — a doctrine which, most assuredly, they had not borrowed from Judaism. The true expression of Jewish thought is found in the Book of Henoch, the Fourth Book of Esdras and that of Jubilees[1]; they proclaim a temporary punishment or happiness until the final retribution and the sentence of the Great Judge.

It is always this last sentence, which is appealed to by the faithful Jew, oppressed by enemies who insultingly laugh at his faith and hopes. The more the human means of religious and national restoration get away and recede from him, the more ardently too he turns towards the Supreme Justice which will render to every one, nations or individuals, according to his deeds, and the more intense also becomes his expectation of the Messias who will set up God's kingdom and restore order in every thing.

The idea of the Messias is intimately connected, in Jewish minds, with the events of the last days of the world. How things will be then conducted and what plan followed: this is a point on which they do not agree. Some place the reign of the Messias before, others after, the judgment and final consummation. Anyhow, we must consider more attentively those doctrines, which, afterwards, Christian Dogma was to express with far more precision and greatly to transform.

---

[1] *Henoch*, $18^{1-6, 14-16}$, $22^{1-9, 11-13}$, $10^{4-6, 12}$; 4 *Esd.*, 7^{75-101}; *Jub.*, 23^{31}.

It is chiefly, nay almost exclusively to the Apocryphal Books, that we must look to find the ideas then prevalent about the Messias. I have already remarked that they ascribe to him preëxistence: "I saw one whose head was heavy with days . . . and near him was another [personage] whose aspect was that of a man, and his face was graceful, as that of a holy Angel (*Henoch*, 46^1) . . . Before the sun and the signs were created, and the stars of the heavens, made, his name was uttered before the Lord of spirits . . . And therefore he has been chosen and hidden before Him before the creation of the world, even from all eternity (*Ibid.*, 48^{3-6})." However these expressions are rather vague, and it is worthy of notice that the books or passages in which they are found are perhaps, nay certainly, later than the coming of Jesus.

On the other hand, the Messias is represented as the Chosen One, the Son of Man, the Son of David, the Christ, the Christ of the Lord, the Son of God.[1] The idea that is everywhere suggested of him is that of a prince, the peculiar prince of the Jewish people, who shall come and set up upon earth an ideal kingdom in which God will be served, as He wishes. Sometimes, he appears as the avenger of God's rights and the destroyer of the wicked. He is a warlike Messias who carries the sword and crushes the nations, or destroys his enemies with a word of his mouth, by the power of truth and of law, and rules the people by his sanctity and justice.[2] In this case, his reign precedes the end of the world and often is only temporary.[3] At other times, God takes upon Himself to avenge His own cause. The judgment first takes place; the wicked are punished and then the Messias appears. He rules forever over a transfigured Israel with a new Jerusalem for his capital.[1] Finally, at other times, as in the chapters of the *Similitudes* in *Henoch* (37–70), the Messias is at the same time, judge, executor and eternal king. This is the highest conception of his functions, which is met with in that literature, the one in which the apex of magnificence and greatness is set before us.

---

[1] *Henoch*, 45^3 and *passim*, 46^{2-4}, etc., 105^2; 4 *Esd.*, 4^{32} (Syriac translation), 7^{29}, 13^{32}, 14^9; *Ps. of Solomon*, $17^{23, 36}$, $18^{6, 8}$.

[2] *Ps. of Solom.*, 17^{23-41}; *Apoc. of Baruch*, 39^7–40^2, 72; 4 *Esdr.*, $13^{37, 38, 49}$.

[3] *Ps. of Solomon*, 17, 18; *Henoch*, 91^{13-15}; *Apoch. of Bar.*, 40^3, 74^2. The Fourth Book of Esdras ascribes to it 400 years of duration; the *Secrets of Henoch* (which, however, does not mention the Messias), 1000 years (32^2–33^2).

However, that greatness never goes beyond the greatness of a created being; it reaches at most that of a supernatural being, never Divine greatness; the Jews never dreamt of a Messias who was God.[2] Nor did they ever think, then, of an expiating and suffering Messias. True, in the Fourth Book of Esdras (7^{29}), the Christ dies, but of a natural death, as a man who disappears, after doing his work. Though a few passages have been pointed out here and there, in subsequent documents, passages which would imply that the Jews had, at the epoch now before us, some thought of the painful satisfaction of the Messias, these indications are rather faint and inconclusive. It is quite evident, from the language of the Evangelists, that the current of thoughts was not at all in that direction.[3]

What we have just said about Messianic beliefs gives us, partly at least, an insight into Palestinian eschatology in the time of Jesus. The eschatological systems of the Apocryphal Books can be reduced to two fundamental types, which have for their basis the more or less long duration, — eternal or temporary, — ascribed to the rule of the Messias. In the first, the coming of the Messias coincides with the end of the world; when he appears, the wicked league together against him, but they are defeated; the universal judgment takes place: the wicked are punished; the just triumph for ever with the Messias. In the second, the reign of the Messias comes to an end before the end of the world. After conquering his enemies, he rules for a while the nation of the just, then the universe is transformed, the dead rise again and are judged; every man gets his reward or his punishment, eternity begins. As is easy to see, the elements are identical in the two systems and differ only by their arrangement. When we pay closer attention, we find in both: (1) The signs forerunning the final catastrophe: disturbance of nature and the overthrow of her laws, awe-inspiring phenomena, wars, famines, universal anxiety, etc.[1] (2) The coming of Elias who is to re-establish all things, *ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα* (*Matt.*, $17,^{10, 11}$; *Mark*, 9^{10-12}; cf. *Eccli.*, 48^{10}). (3) The advent of the Messias in the circumstances already mentioned, either preceding or accompanying or following the judgment and final consummation. (4) The coalition of the wicked against him, under the leadership of one whose name is not given, but whom Christian documents will call Antichrist.[2] (5) The defeat and utter ruin of the allies, sometimes by God Himself, other times and more often by the Messias.[3] (6) The Messianic rule with a new Jerusalem, cleansed of the idolaters by whom she was contaminated,[4] or even come down from heaven;[5] with all the Jewish nation — even the dead — called together from their dispersion;[6] with God for supreme leader and absolute king (*βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*);[7] with its unmixed prosperity, profound peace, perfect joy and happiness.[8] (7) The transformation of the world by the destruction of what was before corruptible and mortal.[1] (8) The resurrection of the dead. This is one of the points on which there was most progress. In the 2nd century B. C., the Jews seem to have admitted the resurrection of the Israelites alone, or even of the just alone, that they may have a share in the rule of the Messias. Afterwards, a general resurrection was believed.[2] (9) The last judgment. In the hypothesis of a reign of the Messias before the end of the world, a first judgment takes place when the Messias destroys and condemns the enemies allied against him. Now, we have to deal with the last judgment. Except in *Henoch* (41^9, 69^{27}, etc.), where this function is vested in the Messias, God Himself is set forth as the judge of the world, and His examination bears on all human deeds recorded in the book of Heaven.[3] (10) The final destiny of men. As a consequence of the divine sentence, the just are rewarded, the wicked, punished. We have seen that, immediately after their death, a temporary retribution is meted out to the just and to the wicked; the last judgment will make it a definite state. The wicked will be cast down into the fire, the *Gehenna*,[4] where they will stay for ever. Josephus tells us expressly that such was the belief of the Pharisees. There will be no room for prayers or intercessions of one for another.[5] As to the elect, they will be received into Paradise in a high place where they shall see the majesty of God and of His angels. Their faces shall shine as the sun; they shall live eternally.[6]

---

[1] *Henoch*, 90^{37}.

[2] JUSTIN, *Dialog. with Trypho*, 49, Otto, II, 164.

[3] *Matt.*, 16^{22}; *Luke*, 18^{34}, 24^{21}; *John*, 12^{34}. Cf. SCHÜRER, *Gesch. des jüd. Volk.*, $2^{553-556}$. (English transl., 2nd Div., Vol. 2, p. 184–187).

---

[1] 4 *Esd.*, 5^{1-13}, 6^{20-24}, etc.; *Jub.*, 23^{13-22}; *Apoc. of Bar.*, 27, 48^{31-41}, etc.

[2] 4 *Esd.*, 13^{33}, ff.; *Henoch*, 90^{16}; *Apoc. of Bar.*, 40.

[3] *Henoch*, 90^{18-19}; *Assumpt. of Moses*, $10^{3, 7}$; *Ps. of Solom.*, $17^{27, 39}$; *Apoc. of Bar.*, 39^{7}–40^{2}, etc.; 4 *Esd.*, $12^{32, 33}$, $13^{27, 28, 37, 38}$.

[4] *Ps. of Solom.*, $17^{25, 33}$.

[5] *Henoch*, 53^{6}; 4 *Esd.*, 7^{26}; cf. *Galat.*, 4^{26}; *Heb.*, 12^{22}; *Apoc.*, 3^{12}, $21^{2, 10}$.

[6] *Ps. of Solom.*, 11^{3}, ff., 17^{28}; 4 *Esd.*, 13^{39-47}.

[7] *Ps. of Solom.*, $11^{1, 4, 38, 51}$; *Assumpt. of Moses*, $10^{1, 3}$.

[8] *Henoch*, 10^{16}–11; *Apoc. of Bar.*, 29^{5-8}, 73^{2-7}; *Ps. of Solom.*, $17^{28, 29, 36, 48}$, etc.

---

[1] 4 *Esd.*, $7^{30, 31}$; *Apoc. of Bar.*, $74^{2, 3}$.

[2] *Apoc. of Bar.*, 50, 51; 4 *Esd.*, $7^{32, 37}$; *Testam. of the Twelve Patr.*, Benjamin, 10.

[3] 4 *Esd.*, 7^{33}, ff.; *Henoch*, $98^{7, 8}$, 104^7; *Testam. of the Twelve Patr.*, Aser, 7.

[4] 4 *Esd.*, $7^{36, 38, 84}$; *Apoc. of Bar.*, 44^{15}.

[5] JOSEPH., *De Bello iud.*, II, 8, 14; *Antiq.*, XVIII, 1, 3; *Testam.*, *of the Twelve Patr.*, Zabulon, 10; Aser, 7; 4 *Esd.*, 7^{105}.

[6] 4 *Esd.*, $7^{36-38, 95-98}$; *Apoc. of Bar.*, $51^{3,7-14}$; *Assumpt. of Moses*, $10^{9,10}$.

These, then, were the religious ideas prevalent among the Jews of Palestine, at the time of the coming of Jesus: which does not mean that they were accepted by all; as a matter of fact, there were serious divergences of opinion about some of them. We know especially — and this is worth noticing — that the Sadducees, the high clergy of Jerusalem and its partisans were not in agreement with the Pharisees and the bulk of the people, and scouted commentaries which aimed at explaining the Law, together with many prescriptions that had been added to it. They went even farther, and denied the existence of spirits and angels and the resurrection of the body.[1] Their attitude towards the Heathen was rather conciliatory, and, anxious as they were to keep up their influence and peacefully enjoy their wealth, they did not hesitate to enter into many compromises. Still, after all, they did not represent the mass of the nation. The latter was gathered around the Pharisees, who, in its eyes, embodied the purity of the doctrine and the ideal of the morals, of the Jews living in Palestine.

§ 3. — Alexandrian Judaism and that of the Dispersion. Philo.

Outside of Palestine, the Jews were found in great numbers chiefly at Alexandria, from the time of Alexander, and still more from that of Ptolemy, the son of Lagus (319 B. C.). There, their intellectual activity was considerable and they came into closer contact with Hellenism. Hence it is that the features proper to the Judaism of the Dispersion are more conspicuous at Alexandria than in any other place, and made known to us almost exclusively by the writings that come from Egypt. No wonder, therefore, that in the following pages, we consider Hellenistic Judaism, chiefly as it exhibited itself at Alexandria.

---

[1] *Acts*, 23^8.

As soon as they settled in that city, the Jews began to learn Greek; they forgot Hebrew to such an extent that a translation of the Bible soon became necessary. But to learn and speak Greek was, at the same time, to penetrate into Greek literature, Philosophy, conceptions, and genius, into the civilization and spirit that language represents, into all that made the Greek race the mistress and teacher of the ancient classical world. What attitude were the Jews to take towards that world new for them? Were they, like their brethren of Palestine, to shut themselves up within the Law, and repeat against the Heathen and their speculations the prophetical anathemas of old, or were they to seek for a ground of conciliation that would secure both their interests and their faith ?

This latter course they made up their minds to follow: the more readily that it was for them the only one truly practical, remote as they were from their country and from any religious centre. The system they adopted, and of which we find in Philo a complete expression, can be summed up in the following points: (1) The Jew remains a Jew; Israel is the chosen nation, possessing in the Books of the Old Testament the complete and pure religious truth: a truth which rests on two fundamental dogmas: monotheism and the immortality of the soul. (2) Yet, Heathenism is not altogether deprived of that truth. Either through an oral tradition, or because they borrowed from the sacred Books of the Jews, its most distinguished philosophers, Pythagoras, Plato, and others, knew, in part at least, the true doctrine about God, Providence, man. (3) Therefore nothing stands in the way, on one hand, of the Greeks adopting Biblical teachings as a complement and sometimes a rectification of their Philosophy, nor, on the other hand, of the Jews adopting those speculations — provided, of course, they are in keeping with the Law — which the Greek genius has multiplied in the field of Metaphysics, Psychology, and Ethics, these speculations, after all, being but derivations from that Revelation of which the early records are in the hands of the Jews. (4) However, as Greek mythology seems rather strange to Jewish minds, and Jewish Philosophy and History rather meagre to Greek minds, it is necessary to show the true contents of both: — to see, in Greek fabulous narratives, only the religious and moral idea they express in making it pass into action, and to be able to find out, under the simple narratives of the Bible, all the philosophical and religious ideas that God has vouchsafed to hide therein. We must explain away the former and render the latter capable of development and see in both nothing but *allegories*. This was the principle of the allegorical method applied to Scripture interpretation which was to become the glory of Alexandrian scholars. The facts recorded in the Bible, are, sometimes, historical; other times, not: they are then mere symbols. Anyhow, that matters very little; but what *does* matter, is to bring out of these narratives the idea they contain, the teaching concealed therein, which God wished to inculcate upon us by directing that they should be written down. (5) And thus, as the Alexandrian Jews thought, there will be a conciliation between Judaism and Hellenism: without ceasing to be a Philosophy, the latter will become a Religion, because it will adopt the supernatural principle of Revelation with its consequences; without ceasing to be a Religion, the former will become a Philosophy, for it will search out by means of reason under the revealed letter, the rational doctrines therein latent.

There are, in this programme, three points which strike us: (1) The little importance ascribed to legal ceremonies: some doctors declaring them indifferent; others, like Philo, thinking that they were useful for a better understanding of the Law and were to be preserved. (2) The universal character assumed by the Jewish religion: it ceases to be a national worship and becomes the religion of all. (3) The insignificant part played by the idea of the Messias: the image of a personal Messias is replaced by that of the Messianic era; the triumph of a given individual, by that of a doctrine or a nation.

Such are the outlines of the religious Judæo-Alexandrian system. Still, besides this general conception, there are a few particular doctrinal features which ought to be pointed out. They are found in the Canonical Books written by Hellenistic Jews and in the authentic or apocryphal books which were not placed in the Canon. Among the former, we must mention the Greek translation of the LXX, begun in the 3rd century and finished towards the middle of the 2nd century B. C., the *Book of Wisdom*, the *Second Book of Maccabees*, and perhaps, too, the deutero-canonical additions of *Esther* and of *Daniel*, as well as the second part of the *Book of Baruch;* among the latter, the *Third* and the *Fourth Book of Maccabees*, the *Letter of the Pseudo-Aristeas*, the *Sibylline Oracles*, in their most ancient parts, the anonymous *Apocalypse* edited by G. Steindorff,[1] the *Fragments of Aristobulus*, the writings of Philo and of Josephus.[2]

---

[1] *Die Apokalypse des Elias, eine unbekannte Apokalypse, und Bruchstücke der Sophonias–Apokalypse*, Leipsic, 1899. Steindorff would date it from about 100 B. C.

[2] The full exposition of the Judæo-Hellenic literature may be found with indication of dates and editions, in SCHÜRER, *Gesch. des jüd. Volk.*, v. III, 304–542 (English Transl., 2nd Div., v. 3, pages 156–381). KAUTZSCH (*Die Apok. und Pseudep. des A. T.*, II) gives most of the Apocryphal works. The two most important fragments of Aristobulus are in EUSEBIUS, *Praep. evang.*, VIII, 10; XIII, 12. The oldest Jewish portions of the *Sibylline Oracles* are the foll.: Book III, 97–828 (145–117 B. C.); 36–92 (about 40–30 B. C.); the 84 verses quoted by Theophilus of Antioch (*Ad Autolyc.*, II, 36, Otto, VIII, 164), which probably made the beginning of Book III; the whole Book IV (about 80 A. D.) and the greater part of Book V (end of 1st century). To the editions of this last work, mentioned by Schürer, we may add that published by GEFFCKEN, 1902. A certain number of verses composed by Jews and attributed to the most ancient Greek poets, Orpheus, Hesiod, Homer, Linus (or Callimachus), Æschylus, etc., were also circulated, as early as the 3rd century B. C., which confirmed the teachings and narratives of Moses. They are quoted by Aristobu-

The fundamental doctrine of these works generally agrees with that of Palestinian books; yet there are a few points in which there is some difference between them. Thus in the former we find a greater care to avoid or explain anthropomorphisms, when God is spoken of. Then too, Wisdom is personified, but in a still more distinct way than in *Proverbs* and *Ecclesiasticus*. Aristobulus (EUSEB., *Praep. evangel.*, XIII, 12, 5) quotes as a verse of Orpheus the following passage: "Before the world was made, the ancient Word shines. He subsists by himself and everything subsists by him; he moves about everywhere, and no man sees him; but he sees both of us." In the book that bears its name, Wisdom is described in terms that will be used by Christian scholars writing about the Word or the Holy Ghost (7–11; cf. especially $7^{25, 26}$). Emanating from God, it has His attributes (7^{22-23}); it is compared or identified with the Holy Spirit (9^{17}); it plays the part of a demiurge ($9^{2, 9}$), though it has also, nay chiefly, a moral part (8^{4-8}; 10, 11). These details show us — and this is worth noticing — that long before Philo, there existed at Alexandria, in a more or less definite shape, doctrines which he did not create, though he did develop them.

In man, the soul is quite distinct from the body, nay is opposed to it and suffers from its being united with it.[1] This is Greek dualism. That soul is immortal: which applies also to the souls of the wicked; otherwise, we could not account for the fine picture presented in the 5th chapter of *Wisdom*. All souls, then, must survive, to receive the reward or punishment due to them.[2]

---

lus and also by the Fathers of the Church, Clement of Alexandria, the Pseudo-Justin (*Cohortatio ad Graecos*, *De monarchia*). These forgeries agree well with what was said above, as to the pretension of deriving Greek traditions from the Bible.

[1] *Wisd.*, $8^{19, 20}$, 9^{15}.

[2] *Wisd.*, 3^{1-8}, $4^{2, 10-18}$, 5^{1-24}. *Anonym. Apocalypse*, STEINDORFF, *op. cit.*, pp. 149 (2), 150 (5), 152 (10).

Taking all in all, eschatology is more simple in the Judæo-Hellenic literature than in the Palestinian. We leave aside the *Sibylline Books* whose character naturally called for more graphic descriptions. Their most ancient author knows the evils which must precede the end of the world and the coming of the Messias (III, 796–806, 632–651), the rule of this victorious and peace-making Messias (III, 652–660), the league formed by wicked princes against him and his people (III, 660–668), the defeat of the allies and their crushing at the hands of God Himself (III, 669–697), the definitive and eternal dominion of the Messias, His messenger (III, 767–784, 712–731, 744–758, etc.). In the other writings, as we have already remarked, hopes that are properly messianic have been generally relegated to the back-ground. Not indeed, that they are passed by altogether: we find reminiscences of them in Philo, in the second book of Maccabees, and perhaps too in Josephus;[1] but the fate of souls after death and at the end of time seems to have attracted most attention. It may be that Josephus[2] admitted, with the Pharisees, a temporary condition of the just souls ὑπὸ χθονός, until the resurrection, and all know the celebrated passage of the second book of Maccabees (12^{42-45}) on prayer for the dead.[3] Still the predominant idea in Hellenic Judaism is that of a retribution, immediately after death. Anyhow, all our witnesses agree in declaring both the rewards of the just and the punishments of the wicked eternal.[4]

As to the resurrection of the body, though it was generally opposed by Greek philosophy, chiefly by that of Plato, we find it formally taught, at least as far as the just are concerned, in the second Book of Maccabees ($7^{9, 11, 14, 23}$; $12^{43, 44}$).

---

[1] Philo, *De execrat.*, 8–9; *De praem. et poen.*, 15–20; 2 *Macchab.*, 2^{18}; Joseph., *Antiq.*, IV, 6, 5.

[2] Antiq., XVIII, 1, 3.

[3] Cf. too *Anonym. Apocal.*, pp. 154, 155 (15–17).

[4] Philo, *De Cherub.*, 1, *De execrat.*, 6; Joseph., *Antiq.*, XVIII, 1, 3; *De Bello iud.*, II, 8, 14; Wisd., 3^4, $4^{2, 16}$; 4 *Macch.*, 9^9, 12^{12}, 15^3, 17^5.

It is in Philo,[1] as has been already said, that the system which is to bring together Judaism and Hellenism assumes its definitive shape. In him the two currents of ancient thought are truly blended. Philo is both a believer and a philosopher, but he is, to say the least, a philosopher just as much as a believer. Some of his doctrines have been already pointed out here and there. Among his other doctrines, the following may be mentioned.

God appears in his works more concrete than in Plato's (*ὁ ὤν*), though He is conceived in the same way. Of this God, nothing limited or even precise can be affirmed, for any precision is a limit, and any property, an exclusion. Of course He is eternal, immutable, simple, free and independent; but it is far better to say simply that He *is* (*ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὤν* — *ᾧ μόνῳ πρόσεστι τὸ εἶναι*), for in reality He is *ἄποιος*, without any quality and property.

How shall this God placed so far above, be able to create the finite and communicate with it? How can the latter come from the infinite, the evil from God? Such was the great problem which preoccupied Plato's philosophy and which Philo attempts to solve by combining or rather by mixing — for his system is altogether lacking in unity — by mixing together the Platonic concept of ideas, the Stoic concept of the soul, as a force latent in the world, the Greek belief about demons and the Biblical teaching about Angels. In God we find the ideas according to which He creates the world; but those ideas are forces at the same time: there is the creative power (*creativa*, *deus*), which brings forth the beneficent power (*benefica*), and the royal power (*regia*, *dominus*) on which the legislative power depends (*legislativa*, *percussiva*). Others are mentioned by Philo, who does not aim at reckoning all these powers; for they are innumerable. These dynamic ideas ("idées-forces") are the intermediaries of God's action upon the world, the λόγοι through which He works: the Bible calls them Angels; Philosophy, demons. But, as they did not possess all the science nor all the sanctity of God, they were unable to put into their work the perfection in which they were lacking; hence comes imperfection and evil in the world.[1]

---

[1] On Philo, cf. the abundant literature given by Schürer, *Gesch. des jüd. Volk.*, v. III, 487, 542 (English transl., 2nd Div., vol. III, pp. 321, 362). Excellent summaries of his philosophy may be found in Zeller, *Die Philos. der Griechen*, III, 2, 353, foll.; Schürer, *loc. cit.*, pp. 544, ff. (English transl., pp. 363, ff.); Edersheim, in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, IV, 377, ff. These authors should be consulted for more detailed information. Cf. too, Herriot, *Philon le Juif*, Paris, 1898; Bréhier, *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie*, Paris, 1908; the article "Philo and the Catholic Judaism of the first century," in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. XI, pp. 25–42.

Are these dynamic ideas really distinct from God? They must be, unless we are willing to admit that God Himself communicates with the finite and is the author of evil. On the other hand, they must not be distinct from God, if we consider them as intermediaries by which the finite participates in and comes from the infinite; and then too, if they are finite, the problem to be solved in regard to the world is to be solved in their regard also. Philo, who was anxious to maintain the divine, though only mediately divine, origin of the world, could not, then, give to the question a precise answer. Hence he is constantly oscillating, on this point, between the affirmative and the negative and nowhere exhibits a doctrine well defined. According to the needs of the system, divine powers are personified and embodied, or vanish away in the essence of God; nothing is definite in their state.

The collection of all those powers constitutes the Word

---

[1] "Man being so disposed that he sins often, God has used in his creation the various powers, in order that only what is good in man may be referred to Him. It was not fitting that, in man's soul, God should trace the road to vice." (*De confusione linguarum*, 35.)

(λόγος), who is at the same time their source and their synthesis. Come from "Him who speaks," he is the principle of the creative and beneficent, royal and legislative powers, though he is also their sum and combination (σύνοδος, κρᾶσις). Hence, like them, he presents a twofold aspect. In regard to creation, he represents God, Whose image and active force he is. He is His name, His shadow, His first-born son (υἱὸς πρωτόγονος, πρεσβύτατος θεοῦ), His image, impress, and copy (εἰκών, χαρακτήρ, ἀπεικόνισμα), therefore another God, a second God (ἕτερος θεός, δεύτερος θεός); he is the reflexion of God, the thought He contemplates (ἔννοια, διανόησις); he is the principle, the oldest Angel, the many-named Archangel, God's prophet and interpreter. On the other hand, in regard to God, the Word represents the universe and man whose archetype he is and who, through him, has a share in God. He is then, *the* man made after God's image (ὁ κατ᾽ εἰκόνα ἄνθρωπος): "Sensible man has been created after the image of an intelligible and incorporeal man, who is the Word of God."[1] "The intelligible world is made up of ideas, incorporeal paradigms," and the Word is the sun paradigm (ἥλιος παράδειγμα), the archetype of the cause (ἀρχέτυπος τοῦ αἰτίου). And just as through the Word God creates and rules the world, so also, through the Word, the universe gives thanks to God and asks His favors: the Word is the high-priest, the suppliant of the world (ἀρχιερεύς, ἱκέτης). Hence he is not a mere physical mediator; he seems to exercise, moreover, a religious and moral mediation.

Is this Word personal and distinct from God? As for the divine Powers, so also in this case, Philo does not give a clear answer. He seems at the same time to affirm and to deny, and the reason of these hesitations is always the same. At bottom, the Philonian concept of the Logos is self-contradictory. A being must be God or creature, finite or infinite; between these two extremes, Philo seeks a middle term: he tells us that the Word is "neither unbegotten like God, nor begotten like us, but in an intermediary way;"[1] but such words as these are a mere formula, a mere affirmation, the desperate expedient of reason in presence of the mystery of creation, and of the relations between the finite and the infinite.

---

[1] *Quaest. et solut. in Genes.*, I, 4

Hence, we should not identify the Word of Philo with the Word of Christianity, that of St. John. If the appellation is the same, the concepts are not the same. Philo never connected his Word with the Messias; neither did he have nor could he have had the idea of the Incarnation. His Word is above all a demiurgic and cosmic power, not a God revealer and redeemer.[2] Still less should we look for the notion of the Christian Trinity in the writings of the Alexandrian Jew; the texts, which to some have seemed to convey it, have a quite different meaning (cf. v. g. *De Abrahamo*, 24).

According to Philo, then, God creates by His Word and Powers. *To create*, perhaps, is not exactly the word which should be used, for, to all appearances, Philo seems to admit a primary matter (*ὕλη*, *οὐσία*) co-eternal with God, shapeless, without anything positive and good, the source of imperfection and evil; into which matter God introduces a divine element, the *νοῦς*, the form and the life, in the measure in which every being is capable of receiving it.

The first object of that creation are the Angels. They fill the air. Some of them, placed in the highest spheres, are occupied exclusively with the service of God; others, nearer to this earth, have united themselves to bodies and become the souls of men. Demons are nothing but evil souls. Thus participating in what is low and sensual in the body, souls also are propagated by generation; however, the intellect (νοῦς), "the soul of the soul," comes from God. As it is easy to see, Philo admits the preëxistence at least of the first souls, and trichotomy.

---

[1] *Οὔτε ἀγέννητος ὡς ὁ θεὸς ὤν, οὔτε γεννητὸς ὡς ὑμεῖς, ἀλλὰ μέσος τῶν ἄκρων* (*Quis rerum divinarum haeres*, 42).

[2] Often indeed Philo used the distinction between the *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος* and the *λόγος προφορικός*, to express the relation of the expressed thought to the internal thought, but he never applies that distinction to the divine *λόγος*.

As well as matter of which it is made up, the body is essentially evil: it is the jail in which the spirit is confined, the corpse which the latter is obliged to carry along (νεκροφοροῦσα). By the very fact of its being in contact with the body, the soul is stained and prompted to commit sin. Nobody, during his life, avoids that sin, if he relies exclusively on his own power (ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ). Nevertheless, Philo does not seem to have a distinct idea of the original stain.

With views such as these, he could not be, in Ethics, anything but a Stoic: which he is, as a matter of fact. To live well is the aim of all science and study: the moral part of Philosophy is the most important of all. We must then renounce sensual pleasure and lead a life as simple and austere as possible. Yet, Philo has not the pride of the Stoics: he does not believe that man can by himself practise virtue, it is God who gives him virtue and makes it grow in his soul: to be virtuous is to come nearer to God. Finally — and this is the apex of Philo's system, — these ascetic practices of the soul, as well as the studies to which it applies itself, have only one aim: to lead it gradually to the direct contemplation of God, to ecstasy. Ordinarily we know God only from His works and in the attributes reflected by these works. But ecstasy sets us free from reasonings, and takes us beyond the attributes, nay beyond the Logos himself, to the divine essence whose ineffable unity we realize. This is the intuitive vision transported, for a while, upon earth.

It is easy to see how far Philo departs, on this point, from what will be the Christian concept of salvation. He does not know of any redemption or satisfaction. Ecstasy is only the last effort of the mind in search of God: it is the lot of a few, of philosophers and scholars.

⁂

Such were the moral and religious surroundings in which Christian Doctrine was preached and began to develop. As we have already said, they were necessarily to influence the way in which the early Christians understood the revealed teaching and expressed it for the following generations.

The influence of Palestinian Judaism was naturally the first to exercise itself, since it was in Palestine that the Church was founded. Such an influence can be detected in the Synoptists and in certain interpretations and logical processes of St. Paul, well calculated to puzzle us; it may still be found in Christian eschatology; Millenarianism is nothing else than a poor legacy of Judaism to Papias and others. However, that influence of Palestinian Judaism did not extend much beyond the beginning of the second century. At this time, Christianity broke with it definitely: it had then, and indeed for a long time, reached the Greco-Roman world and addressed itself to men who were not much preoccupied with the Law and its commentaries.

The influence of Hellenic Judaism was more lasting. Since it was, after all, a bridge joining the two civilizations, it was used by Christianity, as an intermediary to reach the pagan world. Later on also, the exegetical process and the conceptions of Alexandrian Judaism considerably affected the greatest theological school of the first three centuries, that of Clement and Origen.

As to Hellenism strictly so called, it is chiefly by its Philosophy and by its whole culture taken altogether, that it acted on Christian doctrine. Principally after the time of the Apologists, Christians began to reframe mentally in Greek the Palestinian Gospel; viz., they threw into a Greek mould, they enclosed in the forms and categories of Greco-Roman thought the data of Revelation; they began to conceive them and reason about them according to the way in which Greeks used to conceive and reason. The Greek mind was inquisitive: hence new questions arose; then it was fond of defining and aimed at rigorous exactness; hence definitions were prepared and given, a rigorous orthodoxy was aimed at. By a slow assimilation, what was broadly human, what had been deeply thought out and delicately analyzed, in Greek Ethics and Metaphysics, passed into the Evangelical doctrine, to fecundate and connect the teachings of the latter. Most assuredly, that influence of Hellenism was not altogether sound, and in order to remain pure, Christian dogma had to engage with it in more than one battle. Nevertheless, taking all in all, that action was extremely beneficial. Christianity would never have conquered the world nor become a universal religion, had she not cast herself into the only form of thought that could then and can still claim to be universal: — the Hellenic form. She would never have suppressed, from the religious point of view, the distinction between Greeks and Barbarians, Jews and Gentiles, had she remained Jewish in her ways, and failed to acquire, by contact with Greek genius, a suppleness by means of which she could reach all minds and souls.

The most important question is only to know in what measure early Christian doctrine was ultimately modified by its alliance with Greek philosophy and culture, and whether or not the very content of Revelation was not consequently altered. In the new shape Theology gave them by using foreign notions, did dogmas remain the doctrinal equivalent of the Evangelic and Apostolic preaching they aimed at expressing: — the equivalent, I say, without excluding the legitimate developments the germs of which were contained in that preaching? Did Hellenism only supply the Fathers and Councils with incentives and moulds for their thoughts, and with terms and formulas for their teaching, or did it reach the very core of that teaching and introduce there notions incompatible with it? In other words, do the Christians of to-day believe in Jesus and Paul, or in Aristotle and Plato? Are they Christians or Greeks? Such is the problem the *History of Dogmas* has to solve: a problem though, of which the solution by history alone, demands, as is evident, a great amount of delicate analysis and correct appreciation.

CHAPTER II

THE EARLY STATE OF CHRISTIAN DOGMA. — PREACHING OF JESUS CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES[1]

Whatever influences may have later on affected the development of Christian doctrine, this development has, in any case, started from the preaching of Jesus and the Apostles, which is the true immediate source of Christian Dogma; there we will find it in its early state and native shape.

The teaching of Jesus and the Apostles is made known to us by the New Testament. This does not mean that we are sure to have in the New Testament writings all that teaching. Composed as they were for edification and often for the occasion, they do not pretend to expose in a didactic and complete manner the doctrine of the Master and His disciples. The first and second generations of Christians may, nay must have received, on certain points, indications that were not recorded in our canonical books. Some words have been quoted as coming from Our Lord, which these books did not relate. Here and there, a few have been pointed out; but generally they are too unimportant and also too scantily attested to deserve to be taken into account. Practically, the New Testament alone can help us, in this volume, to reconstitute Christian dogma in its early shape.

---

[1] This is what is improperly called the "Theology of the New Testament." G. B. Stevens, *Theology of the New Testament*, p. 593, gives a list of the principal complete works on this topic. The best known and most recent are those of B. Weiss, *Lehrbuch der biblischen Theol. des N. T.*, 5th ed., Berlin, 1888 (translated into English); J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentl. Theol.*, Leipsic, 1896; J. Bovon, *Théologie du Nouveau Testament*, 2nd ed., Lausanne, 1902 and ff.; G. B. Stevens, *Theol. of the N. T.*, New York, 1899. (And also W. Beyschlag, *Neutestamentliche Theologie*, 2nd ed., Halle, 1895 — translated into English.)

Here, however, a few distinctions become at once necessary. For though antiquity placed on the same level of authority the teachings of Jesus and those of the Apostles, and though the latter seem to be but the echo and prolongation of the former, still it cannot be denied that between the preaching of Jesus and the end of the period strictly Apostolic, many years passed — about two thirds of a century — during which the Master's doctrine must have been submitted to reflection and may have received important developments. It has always been admitted that the Apostles, as organs of the Holy Ghost, may have added to the personal teaching of Jesus, complements of a doctrinal or some other character, — complements which of course presupposed that teaching of the Lord as a first and necessary basis, and perfectly harmonized with it.[1] The Evangelic Revelation came to an end only with the death of the last Apostle, and if we wish, then, to give of its content an exposition historically true, we ought to distinguish, as far as we can, its successive strata, and not present, all at once and in a confused manner, elements which are not equally ancient.

We may reckon five such strata: (1) The personal teaching of Jesus; (2) The teaching of the Apostles before St. Paul's apostolic mission; (3) The teaching of St. Paul; (4) That of the

---

[1] This remark is important; it goes to reassure those theologians who would be reluctant to admit 1st, that the Apostolic teaching was, on certain points, more complete and extensive than that of Jesus; 2nd, that into the record made by the Synoptists of the teaching of Jesus, glosses and comments may have crept, that were destined to explain and interpret it. These glosses had an authority similar to that of the words they explained, and by extension may legitimately have been given as the personal teaching of the Saviour. *John*, $16^{13, 14}$.

Apostles after St. Paul; (5) That of St. John: a division which is easy to justify and,— except as to the second and the fourth part which in a summary like ours, may be joined together, — must be followed; and this is what we intend to do.

§ 1.— The Personal Teaching of Jesus according to the Synoptists.

It is in the Gospel that we find related the personal teaching of Jesus. The Synoptists have left us what its burden was, in a narrative which most probably reproduces closely its primitive form. The fourth Gospel has perhaps preserved for us some of its deeper revelations, and, in any hypothesis, has rather translated into another language than literally recorded, the discourses of the Master. Still, these two sources can, nay, must be used, if we wish to set forth an exact and complete summary;[1] though we should avoid mingling their testimony, for their respective tone and standpoint are so different, that we would find it extremely difficult to blend them into an harmonious whole.[1]

---

[1] Here two questions present themselves, which I cannot fully discuss, but in which, however, I had practically to come to a decision. First, can the speeches related by the fourth Gospel as being discourses of Jesus, be considered as representing after all His preaching, and therefore can they be used when it is question of exposing the Master's teaching? Cf. for the affirmative, J. Bovon, *Théologie du Nouv. Test.*, 2nd ed., vol. II, pp. 162 ff.; F. Godet, *Comment. sur l'Evang. de Saint Jean*, 4th ed., Neuchatel, 1902, vol. I, pp. 138 ff. (English transl., vol. I, pp. 126 ff.); Batiffol, *Six leçons sur les Evangiles*, Paris, 1897, pp. 125 ff.; Stevens, *The Theology of the New Test.*, p. 176. — Secondly, even in the Synoptists themselves, whilst acknowledging their substantial fidelity, can we not separate and distinguish what comes really from the Saviour Himself from what, under the influence of a development of Christian thought, — a development previous to their redaction, — has been ascribed to Him? As a matter of fact, several recent authors have tried to make such a separation.— But even supposing that this can be made and is legitimate (which should not be peremptorily denied), we cannot attempt it here, and it would not lead us, after all, to any result much conducive to our aim; since it is generally granted that the doctrine transmitted by the Synoptists is really the doctrine of Jesus, except perhaps in a few details. Cf. on this topic, B. Weiss, *Lehrbuch der biblisch. Theol.*, §§ 10, 11 — English transl., vol. I, pp. 48 ff. — ; Lagrange, *Revue Biblique*, 1903, pp. 299, 300; Rose, *Études sur les Evangiles*, 2nd ed., Paris, 1902 — translated into English — .

According to the Synoptists, the central idea of the teaching of Jesus, an idea to which all that teaching can be reduced, is that of the *Kingdom of God.* The word was known to the Jews,[2] and for many years they had been waiting for the thing itself. John the Baptist had announced that the kingdom was not far (Matt., 3^{2}): Jesus declares that with Him it has come or at least has approached (*ἔφθασεν*, Matt., 12^{28}).

What is this kingdom? The expression *Βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*, used exclusively by St. Mark and St. Luke, is equivalent to the expression *Βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*, of St. Matthew; but it would be better translated by *reign* than by *Kingdom* of God, for *Βασιλεία* originally designates the domination itself, the right of direction, which one exercises, and only by derivation, and secondarily, the domain in which that power is exercised and the subjects it reaches.

We may remark at once that this reign of God, which will be also, as we shall see later on, that of Jesus, is in no way to be political or earthly. On this point Jesus corrects Jewish thought and rejects the idea of a temporal domination, such as His contemporaries expected it to be. To Cæsar, the things that are Cæsar's; to God, the things that are God's (Matt., 22$^{15-22}$; Mark, 12$^{13-17}$; Luke, 20$^{21-26}$). Christ is not judge of human interests (Luke, 12^{14}): He has not come to command, but to obey, and to give His life a ransom for many (Matt., 20^{28}), to save what was perishing (Matt., 18^{11}).

The spiritual character of the kingdom of God is also emphasized by the fact that Jesus opposes it, not to temporal kingdoms, but to that of Satan. The Saviour's language in reference to Angels and demons is generally in keeping with what we have seen was believed at that time. Angels are creatures dwelling in Heaven, where they see God; to them carnal pleasures are unknown (Matt., 18^{10}; Mark, 12^{25}). Superior to men, but inferior to the Son whom they accompany and serve and on whom they depend (Matt., 4^{11}, 16^{27}, 26^{53}; Mark, 13^{32}), they will be, on the day of judgment, the executors of divine justice (Matt., 13^{49}); until that time, several of them are the Angels of little children (Matt., 18^{10}). Besides these good Angels, there are bad ones: the devil and his angels (Matt., 25^{41}): these are spirits (Luke, 10^{20}), but unclean spirits (Matt., 12^{42}; Luke 11^{24}), some of which are more wicked than others: they endeavour to lead men astray and, after being driven out, dwell in deserts, until they feel ready for another invasion (Matt., 12^{43-45}; Luke, 11^{24-26}). Jesus speaks to them, drives them away by His word (Matt., 8^{32}; Mark, 1^{25}) and grants to His disciples the power to do the same (Matt., 10^{8}). He distinguishes sharply this expulsion of demons from the miraculous cures of the sick that He performs and His disciples too will perform (Matt., 10^{8}; Luke, 13^{32}).

---

[1] Besides the general works mentioned above, cf. the special literature in STEVENS, p. 594, and BOVON, vol. I, p. 389, note 1, and p. 402, note 3.

[2] *Wisd.*, 10^{10}; *Ps. of Sol.*, 17^{4}.

Now these spirits have a leader, ὁ σατανᾶς, the adversary, ὁ διάβολος, the slanderer, who represents all of them (Matt., 12^{26}; Mark, 14^{15}; Luke, 10^{18}), and seems to be identified by Jesus with Beelzebub (Matt., 12^{24-27}; Luke, 11^{18-19}). Satan is the prince of a kingdom (Matt., 12^{26}; Luke, 11^{18}), which opposes itself directly to the kingdom of God. He is pre-eminently *the* enemy, ὁ ἐχθρός (Luke, 10^{19}): he it is who sows tares in the field of the good man of the house (Matt., 13^{39}), takes away the good seed from the souls in which it had fallen, (Luke, 8^{12}), and strives to stagger the Apostles, the ministers of the kingdom (Luke, 22^{31}). Hence, between the devil and his angels on one side, and the Saviour on the other, there is a continual struggle, and Jesus gives precisely the fact that

He drives away demons as a proof that the kingdom of God has come (Matt., 12^{28}; Luke, 11^{20}).

If then the preaching of Jesus does not exclude the eschatological idea of a reign of God by justice and truth in a renewed world at the end of ages, still it does exclude the narrow and human conception the Jews had thereof. The well-marked character of the new kingdom is that of a spiritual kingdom. We may examine closely each one of its elements.

The ruler of this kingdom, of course, is God, since it is the *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ* (Matt., 6^{9-10}, 13^{43}, 26^{29}). Now, in the teaching of Jesus, God is not only God, but He is also *the Father*: His own Father (Matt., 11^{17}), the Father of His disciples (Matt., $5^{16, 45}$, $6^{1, 4, 6}$) and of all the subjects of the kingdom, whose kindness extends even to the ungrateful and wicked (Matt., 5^{45}). Though this fatherhood of God was not unknown to the Old Testament, still it assumes on the lips of Jesus a more intimate and gentle meaning. — But, besides God, the kingdom of Heaven admits of another king, Jesus Himself (Matt., $25^{31, 34, 40}$; Luke, $23^{2, 3}$). What is that king and what idea does Jesus give us of His own person?

He presents Himself as the Messias, *ὁ χριστός*: a title which is bestowed on Him by others, and which, at least on two occasions, He positively accepts (Matt., $16^{16, 17}$; Mark, 14^{61-62}). This meaning is conveyed by all His conduct. He knows very well that, in the opinion of the Jews, the kingdom of God must appear with the Messias (Mark, 11^{10}), and He declares that with Himself, this kingdom has come (Matt., 12^{28}; Luke, 11^{20}). When John the Baptist sends to ask Him if He is he that is to come, He answers simply by remarking that He performs the signs announced by the Prophets for the coming of the Messias (Matt., 11^{3-5}; Luke, 7^{19-23}; *cf.* Isaias, $35^{5, 6}$). That Jesus was conscious of being the Messias cannot be doubted.

We find also in the Synoptists two other titles which express that messiahship. First, the title of *Son of Man* which Jesus almost always adopts to designate Himself: [1] a title equivalent, in His eyes, to that of Messias, and which, whilst it veils, as it were, the idea of the temporal triumph connected with this last appellation, emphasizes the common origin of the Saviour and of men, His apparent weakness, His mission of suffering and expiation: a condition necessary for His future glorification.

Then the title of *Son of God* (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ). The messianic meaning of this appellation is not doubtful, on the lips of the Jews and the disciples (Matt., 14^{33}, 16^{16}, 26^{63}, 27^{40}; Mark, 14^{61}; Luke, 22^{70}), and probably too on the lips of the demons (Matt., $8^{29, \text{ff.}}$; Luke, $4^{3, 6}$). Though Jesus Himself never assumed the full title, still He accepted it (Matt., $16^{16,17}$, $26^{63\text{-}64}$; Mark, $14^{61, 62}$; Luke, 22^{7}) and — according to the Synoptists — twice styled Himself "the Son," ὁ υἱός (Matt., 11^{27}; Mark, 13^{32}; Luke, 10^{22}). However, He always called God His Father (Matt., $11^{25, 27}$; Mark, 8^{38}; Luke, $23^{34, \text{ff.}}$). But now a question presents itself. By this term, does Jesus intend merely to express His messiahship, and designate a moral filiation, a special relation of love existing between Himself and God, a filiation, in nature similar, though in degree superior, to that which exists between God and the disciples; or does He extend farther and higher up the bearing of that appellation, and by ascribing it to Himself, does He claim for Himself a true divine filiation, in the metaphysical sense of the term, viz., a nature superior to the created essence?

For such a vast and momentous problem, the Synoptists alone do not perhaps supply us with an adequate and absolute solution. However, there are indications worthy of notice, to the effect that if the preaching of Jesus, such as the first three

---

[1] It is found thirty-one times in Matt., fifteen times in Mark, twenty-six in Luke.

Evangelists expose it, did not contain the precise affirmation of His divinity, still it did insinuate it and, so to speak, anticipated its full revelation. Thus, between the Son, who He claims to be, and men, He places the Angels (Mark, 13^{32}); in this relation of filiation which He lays down as existing between the Father and Himself, He separates Himself from His disciples and the rest of the world: He says "My Father" and "Your Father," but not "Our Father;" He is the Son, the natural heir of the lord of the vineyard (*ὁ κληρονόμος*), whilst the Prophets and the other messengers of God are mere servants (Mark, 12$^{1-12}$); between Him and the Father, there exists an absolutely unique and transcendent relation of reciprocity and equality; nobody knows the Son but the Father, and nobody knows the Father but the Son and those to whom the Son has revealed Him (Matt., 11^{27}; Luke, 10^{22}): finally the enigma proposed by Jesus to the Pharisees about the Messias, the son and yet the lord of David, cannot be solved otherwise than by admitting that, according to Jesus, the Messias must be of a nature superior to David's (Matt., 22$^{41-46}$; Mark, 12$^{35-37}$; Luke, 20$^{41-44}$).

Jesus then proclaims Himself the Messias, the Son of God, the founder of the kingdom: whose mission it is to seek and save what had perished (Luke, 19^{10}) and to give His life a ransom (*λύτρον*) for many (Matt., 20^{28}; Mark, 10^{45}). He must suffer a great deal, be rejected by priests and scribes, die and rise again (Mark, 8^{31}). He has a baptism, with which he must be baptized (Luke, 12^{50}). His blood is the blood of the new Covenant, which is shed for many unto remission of sins (Matt., 26^{28}; Mark, 14^{24}; Luke, 22^{20}). Thus Jesus gives to His death a meaning of salvation: it is the means of our redemption, the deed that works our deliverance.

Now, to this deliverance and to His kingdom, the Saviour calls all men. Though His own ministry must confine itself to the lost sheep of Israel (Matt., 15^{24}), yet, an opportunity being given, He addresses others besides them (Matt., 8^{5-13}, 15^{28}), and though He declares that the evangelization must begin with the Jews (Matt., $10^{5,6}$), He declares also that many shall come from the East and West who shall sit down with the Patriarchs in the kingdom of Heaven (Matt., 8^{11}). The disciples are the salt of the earth, the light of the world (Matt., $5^{13,14}$); the world is the field of the husbandman (Matt., 13^{38}); the Apostles must evangelize all nations (Matt., 28^{19}), all creatures (Mark, 16^{15}); the good news must be spread all over the world, before the consummation, as a testimony to all peoples (Matt., 24^{14}; Mark, 13^{10}): Jesus is for expansion.

Nevertheless, though all men are called to join the kingdom of God, they cannot enter it nor especially belong fully to it, unless they fulfil some conditions. Of these, penance is one, viz., the change of heart (*μετάνοια*, Matt., 4^{17}; Mark, 1^{15}; Luke, 5^{32}), because men are sinners (Matt., 6^{12}; Luke, 13^{1-5}); faith is another: we must believe the divine message (Mark, 1^{15}, 16^{16}; Luke, 18^{8}) and be courageous enough to confess it (Mark, 8^{38}, 9^{26}); the attachment to the person of Jesus must also be reckoned, for He is not only a master who teaches, but also a Mediator in whom we are saved (Matt., $7^{22,23}$, 10^{32-39}, $25^{40,45}$). We must add fidelity to do the will of the heavenly Father (Matt., 7^{21}), humility, a docility like that of little children whom we must resemble (Matt., $18^{3,4}$, 19^{15}; Mark, $10^{14,15}$; Luke, $18^{16,17}$). It is to the poor in spirit, the meek, those who weep, the merciful, the pure, the pacific, the persecuted by the world for justice' sake, that the kingdom of Heaven belongs (Matt., 5^{3-12}); to the violent also, viz., to those who are energetic and resolute, for it lets itself be conquered only after a hard struggle (Matt., 11^{12}). And finally, a condition that sums up all the others, justice (*δικαιοσύνη*, Matt., $5^{6,20}$), which comprises in a general way the fulfilment of all duties in regard to God, the neighbor and oneself.

As to the Ancient Law, sometimes Jesus seems to give its observance as obligatory, and maintain the whole of Mosaism (Matt., $5^{17-19, 23, 24}$, $23^{2, 3, 23}$, 24^{20}). However, it is clear that He spiritualizes the fulfilment of the former and makes less strict the interpretation of the latter (Matt., $12^{1-5, 8, 10-13}$, 23^{26}; Luke, $13^{15, 16}$): and places the intimate dispositions of the soul and the practice of virtues far above external works (Matt., 12^{7}, 23^{23}): and finally that He considers many points of that Law as out of date and precarious. He does not accept some of the impurities it had decreed (Matt., $15^{11, 17-20}$); to the law of retaliation He opposes the precept of the forgiveness of injuries (Matt., 5^{38-41}), condemns divorce allowed by Moses (Matt., 5^{31-32}, 19^{3-9}; Mark, 10^{2-12}), declares that with John the Baptist the Law and the Prophets come to an end (Luke, 16^{16}), gives Himself as greater than the Temple (Matt., 12^{6}) and announces its destruction (Mark, 13^{2}): — a ruin which is sure to entail many changes in ritual ceremonies.

For these ancient prescriptions Jesus substitutes in Christian life, what was already in the Law, viz., the great commandment of the love of God and men, a commandment which He strongly bids His contemporaries remember (Matt., 22^{37-40}). The measure of charity is the sacrifices that it inspires us to make (Matt., $5^{45, 46}$; Luke, 14^{12-14}), and this is why it ought to prompt us to love, not only our brethren (Matt., 5^{22-24}), but also our enemies and persecutors, as the heavenly Father who makes His sun shine upon the good and the bad (Matt., $5^{44, 45}$). It impels us to help them (Luke, 10^{30-37}), to forgive them (Matt., $18^{21, 22}$), to bear their wrongs (Matt., 5^{39}), and to condescend to their most unreasonable requests (Matt., $5^{40, 41}$). On this condition, the children of the kingdom will be perfect as God Himself (Matt., 5^{48}).

We may add to this the exhortation to persevering prayer (Luke, 18^{1}), discreet insinuations on the superiority of celibacy and chastity (Matt., 19^{12}), the merit of voluntary poverty and its necessity for perfection (Matt., 19[21, 23]), the separation from family and kindred (Matt., 19[27-30]; Luke, 14[26]): thus we have some idea — though incomplete — of the Ethics preached by Jesus.

By practising it, one becomes a subject of God's kingdom, *receives* it (Mark, 10[15]) in a more or less complete way, according as it is more or less completely practised. For Jesus does not consider the kingdom of God, only in its eschatological meaning, as a state which will be established at the end of time; He proclaims that it is established even during this life in the world (Luke, 17[20-21]) and in the heart of each believer in particular. The word has, on His lips, at the same time an eschatological, an actual and an individual or intimate meaning. In the first sense and considered in its consummation, the kingdom of God will include only the just (Matt., 13[43], 25[34, 41]); in the second sense and considered as existing upon earth, it contains a mixture of good and bad, who are so in various degrees (Matt., 13[19-30, 37-43, 47-50], 25[1-13, 31-46]); in the third sense, only those receive it and have it in themselves, who fulfil its conditions (Matt., 12[34]).

This leads us to another question. These members of the kingdom of God, whatever their interior state may be, shall they live, in a religious point of view, isolated one from another and joined to God alone, or form a society? Jesus wills them to form a society: the *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ* will be an *ἐκκλησία* (Matt., 16[18], 18[17]): whose nucleus is created by Jesus, when He constitutes the Apostolic College. This Church is set up immovable on Peter as its foundation. To him the keys of the kingdom are given: he binds and looses upon earth, and his decisions are ratified in Heaven (Matt., 16[18, 19]). A similar power is bestowed on the Apostles (Matt., 18[18]); they will teach, baptize, and must be listened to, as Jesus Himself (Matt., 28[19]; Luke, 10[16]). This function of teaching is quite compatible with moderation recommended to masters and the obligation of serving, which is presented as the fundamental duty of any one who has authority (Matt., 23^{8-10}, 20^{25-27})

The Apostles will baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost (Matt., 28^{19}); this baptism is necessary for salvation (Mark, 16^{16}). Besides this rite, there is the eucharistic meal. Jesus gives His Apostles His flesh to eat and His blood to drink, and recommends them to repeat it, in commemoration of Him (Matt., 26^{26-29}; Mark, 14^{22-24}; Luke, 22^{17-20}).

In no other part of the teaching of Jesus — the Synoptists alone being taken into account — do we find a clearer presentation of the person of the Holy Ghost, than in the formula of Baptism. Except in the latter, this person is scarcely more explicitly revealed than in the Old Testament (cf. however, Matt., 12^{32}; Mark, 13^{11}; Luke, $12^{10, 12}$).

Such are, then, broadly sketched, the conditions of the kingdom of God upon earth. But that kingdom itself is only the preparation for a future and definite kingdom which is to be established at the end of the world: a future towards which the Jews, in the time of Our Lord, were looking with a hope mixed with fear. What was His teaching on this capital point?

Substantially it does not much differ from the doctrines then current, if we subtract from these the idea of a temporal and temporary rule of the Messias and modify the material and narrow character of such an idea.

Jesus admits, immediately after death, a retribution at least provisional for the just and the wicked. In the parable called after him, Dives goes down to Hades, while Lazarus rests in Abraham's bosom (Luke, 16^{19-31}). The former suffers from fire and from a parching thirst, the latter is in the greatest joy. Between them there is an insurmountable abyss, which, however, allows them to see and hear each other. As to the *paradise* that Jesus promises to the penitent thief (Luke, 23[43]), it does but signify the happiness of the future life.

But, while the Saviour is rather reticent as to the condition of men immediately after death, He speaks out in regard to the fate of the world on the last day.

The final catastrophe shall be preceded by foreboding signs, the ἀρχὴ ὠδινῶν (Matt., 24[6-14]; Mark, 13[7-13]; Luke, 21[9-19]); there shall be wars, plagues, famines, earthquakes; the disciples shall be hated, persecuted, beaten and put to death. Then the θλίψις μεγάλη, the great tribulation shall come (Matt., 24[15-28]; Mark, 13[14-23]; Luke, 21[20-24]); men shall see in the holy place the abomination of desolation, the evils shall be such as have never occurred since the beginning of the world. Then the final crisis will break out (τὸ τέλος, Matt., 24[29-31]; Mark, 13[24-27]; Luke, 21[25-28]): the sun shall be darkened, the moon shall not give her light, the stars shall fall from Heaven, the powers of Heaven shall be moved, and suddenly, as lightning (Matt., 24[27]), the Son of Man shall appear on the clouds, full of glory and majesty (*cf.* Matt., 26[64]; Mark, 14[62]; Luke, 22[69]). He shall send His Angels with trumpets to gather together, not only the just, but all nations (Matt., 25[32]). All the dead shall rise (cf. Matt., 5[29, 30], 10[28], 22[23-33]; Mark, 12[18-27]; Luke, 14[14], 20[27-40]); and the judgment shall begin, presided over by the Son of Man Himself (Matt., 25[32, 33], 16[17]); it shall reach every individual (Matt., 16[27], 22[1-14]), and extend itself to all his works (Matt., 13[41], 25[35-45]).

For it is according to his deeds that man is to be judged, not according to his nationality or religious external appearance (Matt., 25[34-45], 7[21-27], 8[11, 12]; Luke, 13[25-30]). The sentence shall be most consoling for the just. Like the Angels (Matt., 22[30]; Mark, 12[25]; Luke, 20[36]), they shall live an everlasting life (Matt., 25[46]; Luke, 20[36]) in the contemplation of God (Matt., 5[8]). Their state is compared to a wedding banquet

(Matt., 22^{2-14}, 25^{10}). The elect are reclining on resting-couches, with the Patriarchs (Matt., 8^{11}) or sitting on thrones (Matt., 19^{28}; Luke, 22^{30}); they shine as stars (Matt., 13^{43}). Still, their felicity has a manifestly spiritual character. Here the capital word is *life everlasting* (Matt., 25^{46}; Mark, 10^{17}; Luke, 10^{24}), often used as the equivalent of a complete possession of God (Matt., $25^{34, 46}$). In no passage is it implied that the expression "everlasting" must be understood in a broad sense: on the contrary, Jesus positively declares that the just shall never die (Luke, 20^{36}).

Quite different, indeed, is to be the fate of the wicked: it shall be most terrible: it is the *ἀπώλεια* opposed to life (Matt., $7^{13, 14}$). Perhaps, judging from the word, we might think of destruction: however, such is not the thought of Jesus. The wicked driven away from Him (Matt., 25^{41}; Luke, 13^{27}) shall be cast down into Gehenna, *γεέννα* (Matt., $5^{22, 29, 30}$, Mark, $9^{42, 46}$), into a Gehenna of fire (Matt., 5^{22}), into the everlasting fire (Matt., 25^{41}; Mark, 9^{42}), at the same time, however, a place of darkness where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth (Matt., 8^{12}, 25^{30}; Luke, 13^{28}). There, they shall suffer for ever; their fire shall never be put out, nor their worm die (Matt., $25^{41, 46}$; Mark, $9^{42, 47}$).

What will be the relation of the punishment or the reward to the works which have deserved it? The former will be proportioned to the malice of each culprit, according to his disposition and knowledge (Matt., 11^{22-24}, $12^{41, 42}$; Luke, $12^{47, 48}$), for from him who has received more, more shall be asked. As to the latter, sometimes it is represented as equal for all and as a gift (Matt., 25^{14-23}, 20^{1-16}): other times too, as proportional to merits (Luke, 19^{12-19}): —a contradiction which can be solved, if we remark, on one hand, that the reward itself is so excellent that it surpasses the demand of the merits and is truly gratuitous (cf. Luke, 6^{38}), and, on the other hand, that by reason of its very excellence, all slight distinctions between merit and merit seem to fade before it. These distinctions, however, do not altogether disappear, and among the subjects of the kingdom of Heaven, there will be an order (Matt., 5^{19}).

There remains the question of the day and hour when the world is to come to an end. Everyone knows how difficult it is to draw from the Synoptists a clear idea of the Master's teaching on this topic. As we have seen, the contemporaries connected the eschatological crisis with the coming of the Messias, and it is quite true that, for a while, the disciples and early Christians were expecting, as if in the near future, the second advent (the "parousia") of the Messias. As to the Saviour Himself, sometimes He seems to announce it as if near at hand (Matt., 10^{23}, $16^{27, 28}$, 24^{34}; Mark, 8^{39}, 13^{30}; Luke, $9^{26, 27}$, 21^{32}); at other times, on the contrary, He seems to place it far away in the future: such is the meaning of some parables (Matt., $13^{31, 32}$, 24^{48-50}, 25^{5-14}) and sometimes too of the direct speech; the end shall come only when the Gospel has been preached in the whole world (Matt., 24^{14}; Mark, 13^{10}). To explain these contradictions, scholars have set forth various hypotheses we have not to discuss.[1] What is clear, is that Jesus was not willing to make His Apostles nor us acquainted with the moment of His "parousia" (Matt., 24^{36}; Mark, 13^{32}). He announced only that it would surprise us (Luke, 12^{40}) and therefore we ought to watch: *Vigilate* (Matt., $24^{42, 44}$, 25^{13}; Luke, 12^{37-40}).

---

[1] The best theory is perhaps that which sees in the *kingdom of God*, a complex idea, designating at the same time an *era of justice* and an *era of happiness*. As an era of justice, the kingdom of God was in fact announced by Jesus as near at hand and as having come with Him; as an era of happiness, it was to appear in its fulness only after many centuries: a distinction which at first was not clearly realized by the early Christians, though gradually and afterwards experience was to bring it home to them.

§ 2. — The Teaching of Jesus according to St. John.

Let us now open the fourth Gospel. The notion and the term of the kingdom of God are not absent from it ($3^{3, 5}$), but they are found there quite seldom, and it is another concept, another terminology which presents itself to us. The kingdom of God is replaced by the life, the eternal life which is brought to us. In the Synoptists Jesus has spoken chiefly of His ministry and of us; here, He tells us a great deal about Himself and His relations to the Father; in the Synoptists, He had so little emphasized the idea of His mediation, that, according to some, it cannot be found in these Gospels; here, we find it at every step; and finally the doctrine of the Holy Ghost suddenly assumes a considerable development, while the eschatological drama disappears before a more intimate and spiritual conception of the divine judgment.

"God is spirit, and they that adore him must adore Him in spirit and in truth" (4^{24}). These words do away with Jewish particularism, and already insinuate the direction of the new teaching. "God so loved the world as to give His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him, may not perish but may have life everlasting" (3^{16}). The love of God for men is in some way or other more intense and personal than what we have found so far. God is a Father, but above all the Father of Jesus, and it is by sacrificing the latter, that He shows He is our father also.

For if, in the Synoptists, Jesus in fact separates Himself from His disciples in His relations with the Father, such an attitude of His is far more striking in St. John. He declares Himself the Son of God (5^{28}, 9^{35-37}, etc.), the Son by way of eminence ($3^{16, 35}$, 5^{19-22}, etc.); there is, in distinction from everything else, *the Father* and *the Son* ($3^{35, 36}$, 5^{19-22}). Between this Father and this Son the relations are intimate: the Father is the source of the Son's being and action ($5^{19, 26}$); He works in the Son; the Father and the Son know (10^{15}; cf. 8^{55}) and love each other (5^{20}, 14^{31}, 15^{9}); they remain one in the other (8^{29}, $14^{10, 11}$), they are but one, ἕν (10^{30}, $17^{11, 21, 22}$). What belongs to one belongs to the other also (17^{10}), and, as the Father has life in Himself, He has given to the Son to possess life likewise (5^{25}). Hence, to behold or reject the Son, is to behold or reject the Father (8^{19}, 14^{9}, 15^{21-24}); to both a like honor is to be paid (5^{23}).

The Son existed before He appeared in the world: Jesus was before Abraham (8^{58}), He was glorified with the Father before the world was in existence (17^{5}): from Heaven He comes and to Heaven He goes back (6^{62}, cf. $6^{33, 51}$), for the Father, who is greater than He (14^{28}), has sent Him into the world (3^{16}) there to fulfil a mission (5^{36}, 14^{31}, 15^{10}, ff.), to speak, to judge, to act in His own name also (8^{26}, $10^{32, 37}$).

Yet, the proper object of the mission of Jesus is not to judge the world, but to save it (3^{17}; cf. 4^{42}), to give it everlasting life: this idea is expressed again and again ($3^{16, 36}$, 4^{14}, ff.). Jesus is the life (14^{6}), and He comes to communicate it abundantly to us (10^{10}). He is also the light, and He comes to enlighten the world (3^{19}, 8^{12}, 12^{46}), that it may know God, for to know God and His Son, Jesus, is life everlasting ($17^{2, 3}$). To that office of teaching is added an office of suffering, dimly announced. Jesus is to give His flesh for the life of the world (6^{51}): He is the good shepherd who dies for his flock ($10^{11, 18}$): such is the Father's command (10^{18}).

How shall we receive that light, partake of that life, profit by that redemption, which are offered us? By attaching ourselves to the person of Jesus, by becoming one with Him. As Jesus is united with the Father, so also we must be united with Jesus to be united with God: this is the whole economy of salvation. He is the light that leads to life (8^{12}, 12^{46}), the gate of the sheepfold through which all have to enter ($10^{7, 9}$), the good shepherd whose sheep we ought to be ($10^{11, 14}$), nay, the vine whose branches we are, from which alone we can get supernatural sap, and in which alone we can bear fruit (15^{1-7}). Hence for us the necessity to abide in His love, as He abides in the love of His Father (15^{7-10}). After this, the other conditions of salvation are nearly those which we find in the Synoptists: — to be born again of water and the Holy Ghost (3^{3-7}), to believe the Saviour's words (3^{16}, 5^{24}, 6^{40-47}), to eat His flesh and drink His blood ($6^{52, 59}$).

Similar also is the idea given us of the Church and her organization (13^{20}, 17^{18}, 20^{23}, 21^{15-17}); but a doctrine which is most strongly set forth on this occasion is that of the Holy Ghost. He is sharply distinguished from the Father and the Son ($14^{16, 26}$, $16^{7, 13-15}$): He proceeds (*ἐκπορεύεται*) from the former (15^{26}), but He receives (*λαμβάνει*) from the latter ($16^{14, 15}$) what He shall say and announce to the Apostles ($16^{13, 14}$, 14^{26}); and this, because everything that is the Father's is the Son's also (16^{15}). Both send Him ($14^{16, 26}$, 15^{26}, 16^{7}); yet, He is not separated from them, for the Father and the Son accompany Him in His descent into the faithful (14^{23}). He is the Spirit of truth ($14^{16, 17}$, 15^{26}, ff.), whose part is to render testimony to Jesus, viz., to confirm interiorly His teaching (15^{26}), to make it fully realized by the Apostles, and if need be, to explain it Himself (15^{26}, 16^{13}). With these Apostles He is to stay forever ($14^{16, 17}$): on the contrary, the world cannot receive Him (14^{17}), and He witnesses against the world (16^{8-11}), for that world, to which Jesus is a stranger (8^{23}, 18^{36}), hates Jesus and His Church (15^{18-23}), and the Saviour did not pray for it (17^{9}).

For, as a matter of fact, though all men are, in principle, called to become the children of God (10^{16}, 11^{52}, 12^{32}), all do not answer the call. That unfaithfulness had been foretold (12^{37-40}): it is the consequence of a divine plan, for nobody comes to Jesus unless he is drawn by the Father (6^{44}), and the latter has given to the Son only a certain number of men

(17^6); it is the consequence also of human perversity. Men repel light, because they are determined to do evil (3^{19-21}), to follow their own will and trust in themselves (7^{17-18}, 9^{41}).

From this rejection of light, the judgment follows. The Saviour preserves the original meaning of this word; it is a sorting, a separation: "This is the judgment: because the light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than the light: for their works were evil (3^{19})." Thus, the judgment begins as soon as one refuses to receive Jesus. He who does not believe is already judged by his very incredulity (3^{18}): he does not need any external judge; his obduracy and the words he despised will suffice to show most conspicuously in the last day the state of separation in which he has placed himself (12^{48}). According to this meaning, he who believes is not judged (3^{18}, 5^{24}). And thus it is true that Jesus has not come to judge (3^{17}, 12^{47}; cf. 8^{15}), because the wicked themselves are their own judges and separate themselves; on the other hand, it is true that He *has* come to judge, because His coming has been the occasion of the sifting of those who are willing, from those who are unwilling, to see (9^{39})

This first judgment, internal and hidden, does not exclude another judgment, general and public, which is to take place at the end of the world and be presided over by the Son. At His voice, all shall arise, the good, unto life; the wicked, unto judgment ($5^{28,29}$). That resurrection of the just seems to be ascribed specially to the influence of Jesus ($6^{39,40,44}$), whose flesh and blood they have received (6^{54}). As to the fate of these and of those, it will be after all but the development tasted and felt of what existed already here below: for the just, the blooming of the life they possessed as a consequence of their union with Christ (6^{47}, 14^3); for the wicked, death and God's wrath always standing against them (3^{36}; *cf.* 8^{24}).

Though, as it is easy to see from what has just been said, there is a sensible difference between the tone of the fourth

Gospel and that of the Synoptists, still, we could not find between them an opposition strictly so called. Sometimes there is prolongation of the lines, other times, too, transposition or diversity, but never contradiction. Under the name of life everlasting, the kingdom of God has become something more intimate and personal; likewise, the judgment is not a merely future event, it begins within the conscience. On the other hand, the relations of nature between the Son and the Father, His divinity and character of necessary mediator, the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, are presented in bolder relief. All this is no departure from the frame of the Master's thoughts and must be regarded as its echo or faithful interpretation.

§ 3. — The Teaching of St. Paul.[1]

Between Jesus and St. Paul, whose first Epistle to the Thessalonians, the most ancient, according to a certain number of scholars, of all those we possess, was written about the year 53, more than twenty years passed, during which the Apostles preached, even perhaps some of them may have written. Later on we shall group together all that concerns their teaching, and now present that of St. Paul.

We find it, of course, in his Epistles [2] and in some discourses recorded in the *Acts*. Scholars agree in regarding that teaching as an organic whole, which expands itself under the Apostle's pen, if not in an externally methodical order, at least according to a principle rigorously followed. But what is that principle? Here the controversy begins. In his system of Christianity, does St. Paul start with the idea he forms to himself of God, of Christ or of man? Is his doctrine theocentric, Christocentric or anthropocentric? All these various solutions have been proposed, and this, not without some appearance of reason. The power of realization in the Apostle is so strong and synthetic that, whatever point he actually takes up and considers, he knows how to reduce to it all his teaching and thus make it appear at if it were truly the centre of his thoughts. Still, this question has for us only a secondary importance, and what we have to show is chiefly the way in which St. Paul's doctrine develops that of Jesus. We are more interested in its objective side than in the manner in which it was conceived, and therefore we have not precisely to study how it was subjectively deduced. A summary, which, starting with God, follows His action in the world and gradually presents the history of humanity, seems well enough to depict the movement of the Apostle's thoughts and be fitted briefly to express their content.

---

[1] Besides the general works above referred to, cf. the special literature on this topic in Stevens, *Theol. of the N. T.*, p. 594; Jacquier, *Histoire des livres du Nouveau Testament*, vol. I, passim — translated into English, in the *International Catholic Library*, 1906 —.

[2] We will treat by itself the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, which, though it reproduces St. Paul's doctrine, is not generally ascribed to him as its immediate author.

According to St. Paul, as according to Jesus, God is a Father: He was so already by creation: He becomes still more so by redemption. The word *Abba*, Father, comes spontaneously to our lips under the action of the Son's Spirit, that is granted to us (R., $8^{15, 29}$; G., $4^{5, 6}$; E., $1^{4, 5}$). But at the same time, that God is a sovereign whose absolute dominion is fully and inflexibly affirmed. He is the God of Job against whom to argue is perfectly useless; His will is law and our law; we must bow and adore (R., 9^{14-21}; 1 Tim., 1^{17}, $6^{15, 16}$).

Only one purpose preoccupies that will, as soon as it goes out of itself and begins to act outside: — to prepare the salvation of the Elect: this is a design of love. Creation and redemption shall be only successive means of fulfilling it (R., 8^{28}; E., $1^{4, 5}$, 3^{11}; 2 Tim., 1^{9}). Creation is a first revelation of God (R., 1^{20}); Incarnation is a second. Thus St. Paul points out the unity of history and will maintain it, notwithstanding the opposition between the Gospel and the Law.

When he came forth from the hands of God, man was good. The close relation between the flesh and sin, a relation which will be emphasized by the Apostle, is not an essential and absolute relation. The flesh is not necessarily evil; it is by the first man's transgression (*παράπτωμα*) that sin, evil, has come into the world (R., 5^{12-19}). This sin St. Paul personifies in some way, and presents as an objective and living reality. A new power (*ἡ ἁμαρτία*) appears, which generation propagates in the children of Adam according to the flesh (R., $5^{12, 18, 19}$), and which is not the sinful act, the transgression itself (*παράβασις, παράπτωμα*) (R., $5^{14, 15}$, 2^{23}; G., 6^{1}); it is its consequence and, at the same time, the principle, that leads to it, the bent that inclines towards it: in one word, it is *concupiscence*. Sin dwells in man over whom it exercises an invincible tyranny (R., $7^{5, 8, 15, 19, 20}$) and for whom it is an inevitable law (R., $7^{21, 23}$); man is the slave of sin (*πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν*, R., 7^{14}).

Sin is seated immediately in the flesh (*σάρξ*). By the flesh, is not to be understood the body (*σῶμα*), but the substance of the body, in as much as it is the principle of those tendencies which incline us to evil, or those tendencies themselves, the whole man, the soul in so far as it follows them and acts in keeping with them in its moral life. And thus St. Paul tells us of a wisdom, will and spirit of the flesh, of carnal man (*φρόνημα, θέλημα, νοῦς τῆς σαρκός*, R., 8^{6}, 7^{15}; E., 2^{3}; Col., 2^{18}). That flesh is a flesh of sin, the body, a body of sin (R., 6^{6}, 8^{3}).

Sin has for its fruit death, which it has introduced into the world (R., $5^{12, 14, 15, 17}$, 6^{23}).

Such, then, is the state in which man has been placed by Adam's transgression: he has been made a sinner, corrupted in his nature and led to death. In these straits, what resources are left him? None. Of course, his mind still sees the good, the duty, and what St. Paul calls the inward man likes it and delights in it, but with a will altogether too weak to do it (R., 7^{15-22}). The Law itself will be of no help to him, nay, it will become an occasion of ruin, for though the Law is in itself just, holy and spiritual (πνευματικός), though it expresses the will of God (R., $7^{12, 14}$), yet man is carnal (σάρκικος, R., 7^{14}), and by showing him his duty without giving him the power to fulfil it, the Law does but make him more guilty. Were it not for the Law, sin was no more, it was not known as such nor imputed (R., 3^{20}, 5^{13}, $7^{7, 8}$): because of the presence of the Law, it revives, is multipled and shoots forth in every direction its deadly scions (R., $7^{9, 11, 13}$): so that the part of the Law has been, as it were, to render iniquity abundant, in order that sin might be exhausted by its very fecundity (R., 5^{20}; G., 3^{19}); but in doing this, it has killed man who had become, for his transgressions, amenable to punishment (R., 6^{11}; G., 3^{10}).

Thus, whether he was a Jew or a pagan, whether he lived under the natural law alone or under the Mosaic law, man was lost save for the divine intervention. Happily for him, here is another power which rises against sin: — Divine justice (ἡ δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, R., $3^{21, 22}$), not indeed that attribute which judges and chastises, but the sanctity of God, His exemption from any moral spot and stain, a justice which He imparts to others and by which He makes just those who believe in Jesus (εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον, καὶ δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ, R., 3^{26}).

That justice of God, thus anxious, as it were, to communicate itself, sets *grace* in motion, viz., the kindness and tenderness of God towards us (R., $5^{20, 21}$), a kindness whose eternal purpose is our salvation and that of all men (E., 1^{4}; 1 Tim., $2^{3, 4}$), and the first token it gives us of its sympathy for us is the *promise*.

For, as a matter of fact, the promise of the Messias made to Abraham was in the past the real help granted to man. It was not Moses and his Law, which, as we have seen, became only an occasion of sin, that are the true anticipation of Jesus and His Grace, but Abraham and the promise He received

(G., 3^{6-18}). The true faithful, the true Israelites, are not the Jews according to the flesh, viz., the subjects of the Law, but rather those who believe, with Abraham, in the promise, and inherit his faith (R., 9^{6-8}; G., 4^{28}). However, just as the child is treated as a servant until his emancipation, though he is, in principle, the lord of his estate, so also the spiritual children of Abraham have been placed under the Law until the Gospel would bring to them freedom and the use of their rights as sons (G., 3^{29}, $4^{1-7, 22-31}$).

This setting free will be the work of Jesus. He appears as the second and supreme manifestation of God's kindness towards us, the true object of the promise (G., 3^{16}). He is of our race and blood (R., 1^{3}; G., 4^{4}), since He is to represent us and take our place. Still, though He is a man and assumed flesh, He has not known sin (R., 8^{3}; 2 Cor., 5^{21}). Moreover, as a man, He possesses a rank of His own: He is the second Adam, the new man. The first, who was from earth, was earthly (*ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός*): the second is from Heaven and therefore heavenly (*ἐπουράνιος*); and, as our birth made us, like Adam, *χοϊκοί*, so our spiritual birth in Christ makes us, like Him, *ἐπουράνιοι* (1 Cor., 15^{47-49}). These expressions, *ἐπουράνιος*, *ἐξ οὐρανοῦ*, probably refer to the Saviour's origin. But St. Paul's concept goes much higher still. He clearly implies the pre-existence of Jesus (G., 4^{4}; 2 Cor., 8^{9}) and ascribes to Him a part in the creation (Col., 1^{15-17}; 1 Cor., 8^{6}). Jesus is not only the Son of God as the just of the Old Law were; He is the proper Son of God (*ἴδιος*, R., 8^{32}), the Lord (*κύριος*), the only Lord as the Father is the only God (1 Cor., 8^{6}); His name must be invoked and before Him every knee should bow (1 Cor., 1^{2}; Ph., 2^{9-11}); Paul does not hesitate to apply to Him the texts of the Old Testament, written of God Himself (R., 10^{11-13}; 1 Cor., 10^{9}; E., 4^{8}). Finally, the Apostle's doctrine reaches its ultimate expression in the well known passage of the Epistle to the Philippians ($2^{6, 7}$), which proclaims Jesus preëxisting *εν μορφῇ* θεοῦ, and equal to God (ἴσα θεῷ). Nor can it be conclusively proved that the θεός of the Epistle to the Romans (9[5]) does not refer to Jesus, and if it be objected that, anyhow, the Apostle subordinates Christ to the Father (1 Cor., 15[28], 11[3]), it can be easily answered that such a subordination is only one of ministry, not of essence, and that precisely in the passage of 1 Cor., 11[3], the parallelism between man and woman, on one side, and God and Christ, on the other, is preserved only if between these there is identity of nature.

For St. Paul, then, Jesus is at the same time really man, and, in the absolute sense of the word, true Son of God. His part is to save us, or rather to be, in the hands of God, the instrument of our salvation, for it is God who is, in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself (2 Cor., 5[19]): for this purpose, Jesus becomes our representative and takes our place. Though being Himself without sin, He was made sin for our sakes, that, dying with Him and in Him, we may become in Him the justice of God (R., 6[6, 8]; 2 Cor., 5[14, 15, 21]). Since He represents us, He is our victim: His death is the price of our ransom, a means of propitiation (τιμὴ, ἱλαστήριον), in which we partake, being included in Him (R., 3[25], 6[6]; 1 Cor., 6[20]; G., 3[13]; E., 1[7]). Yet, grace and redemption are, in principle and on the part of God, spontaneous and gratuitous, since the Incarnation and the death of Jesus are themselves, the greatest of all graces (R., 5[8]; E., 1[3-6], 2[4-7]).

The death of Jesus is, then, the keystone of the whole work of restoration, and we may understand why St. Paul wishes to know but Jesus crucified (1 Cor., 2[2]). Sin, crucified in Jesus, dies also in us, since we were included in Jesus (R., 6[6-15]). This is the negative part of justification; the positive part now unfolds itself. As we are dead to sin with Jesus and in Jesus, so with Him and in Him we rise to a new life (R., 6[4, 5, 8, 11], 4[25]). The second Adam is a vivifying spirit (1 Cor., 15[45]; 2 Cor., 3[17]); and just as the first Adam had communicated to us sin and death, so likewise the second communicates to us His justice and life (R., 5^{15-21}; G., 2^{20}), viz., that justice and sanctity of God which He possessed and of which the new life He assumed on rising from the grave is the symbol (R., 6^{4-11}, 4^{25}).

How is this communication effected? Natural generation, as we have seen, transmits the sin of Adam to his descendants; Baptism and faith transfuse into us the life of Jesus. Through Baptism, we are buried with Jesus unto death: we die to sin and then we rise with Him (R., 6^{3-8}; cf. E., 2^{5-6}; G., 3^{27}). Through faith, which incorporates us into Jesus, we are made partakers of His justice and merits (R., 3^{22-25}, 9^{30-33}; G., $2^{16, 20}$, $3^{2, 5-12, 23-27}$). We may remark that this faith is no mere adhesion of the mind: according to St. Paul, it implies the complete surrender to God of man, of his activity and heart (R., 1^{5}, $6^{16, 17}$, $10^{10, 16, 17}$; G., 2^{20}; 1 Th., 2^{12-13}). It does not exclude all works in general, but only those from which faith is absent and which some might be tempted to consider the principle of justification and salvation (R., $9^{31, 32}$; G., 2^{16}, $3^{2, 5, 10-12}$).

Sin had in the flesh its root and seat; the new life brought to us by redemption has the Spirit (*πνεῦμα*) for its principle and seat. Besides the general sense, in which we oppose it to flesh, sin, exaggerated legalism, the word "Spirit" presents, in St. Paul, shades of meaning, which it is sometimes difficult to seize. Thus, in some cases, it seems to designate the soul or man himself, in as much as he is under the influence of God's Spirit and aspires to heavenly things (R., 8^{4-10}; G., 5^{16}; *cf.* 1 Cor., $2^{14, 15}$). More often, it designates the Spirit of God working in man: this Spirit is the source of grace and of the charisms (1 Cor., 12^{3-11}); He dwells in our bodies and makes them sacred (1 Cor., 3^{16}, 6^{19}); one day, He will raise them from the grave (R., 8^{11}); He works also, nay, chiefly, in the soul, by imparting to it a new life and being for it a God-given token of its divine sonship (R., 8^{14-16}; 2 Cor., 1^{22}, 5^{5}; G., 4^{6}). Moreover, there are several passages in which, evidently, the Spirit is not regarded as an operation of God in general, but as a determined person, the person of the Holy Ghost. He helps our weakness, prays in us (R., $8^{26, 27}$), and bears witness that we are the children of God (R., 8^{16}). He is in God whose secrets He knows (1 Cor., 2^{11}); He is also in us who become His temples (1 Cor., 3^{16}, 6^{19}). He is distinguished from the Father and from the Son (R., 8^{11}), being at the same time the Spirit of God and of Christ (R., 8^{9}), sent by the former and belonging to the latter (G., 4^{6}). And thus, without giving an explicit presentation of doctrine on the Trinity, St. Paul always supposes that, in the minds of his readers, these names of Father, Son, and Spirit, stand for three divine terms whose relations he does not accurately define, but which he joins together into a formula of blessing, that may be called Trinitarian (2 Cor., 13^{13}).

Not all men receive the Spirit nor obey the Gospel (R., 10^{16}): there are enemies of the cross of Jesus, whose end is ruin (Ph., 3^{18-19}). This is the mystery of predestination, which St. Paul resolutely considers and the two elements of which he strongly maintains: on one hand, the sovereign independence of God who saves whom He wills, and, ultimately because He wills (R., $9^{14, 29}$); on the other hand, the freedom of man who is lost only through his fault and incredulity (R., 9^{30-33}, 10^{14-21}). The mystery itself Paul does not explain, nor does he feel the need to explain it, since God's glory is manifested just as well by the loss of some as by the salvation of others (R., 9^{20-23}).

As to the faithful who receive the Gospel and share in the life of the Spirit, they make up the Church. Christians being the members of Jesus, the Church is His body, a body of which He is the head (R., $12^{4, 5}$; 1 Cor., 12^{27}; E., $1^{22, 23}$, 5^{23}; Col., 1^{18}, 2^{19}), maintaining its unity and developing its organs (E., $4^{15, 16}$). In her turn, she is the complement and perfecting of Jesus, His pleroma (πλήρωμα, E., 1^{23}). The

Spirit of truth, that abides in her, renders her the pillar of truth (1 Tim., 3[15]); He distributes in her ministries and functions (1 Cor., 12[4-11, 28-31]): though all those ministries come from one and the same Spirit in whom we were baptized and who unites us all in Himself (1 Cor., 12[13]).

In this universal Church, however, St. Paul distinguishes, chiefly in his Pastoral Epistles, particular communities, which he calls also churches, and, among the members of those churches, overseers (*ἐπίσκοποι*) and deacons (Phil., 1[1]), of whom he demands certain virtues (1 Tim., 3[1-13]). He speaks too of presbyters who preside (1 Tim., 5[17, 19]), and whom he identifies, partly at least, with the overseers (Tit., 1[5-9]); there ought to be, in every city, some presbyters whose mission it is to exhort, preach the sound doctrine and rebuke the gainsayers (Tit., 1[5, 9]; 1 Tim., 5[17]). A certain number of those presbyters, if not all, are then, at the same time, teachers (*διδάσκαλοι*), and the functions of which we have just spoken cannot be altogether distinct from those St. Paul enumerates in the Epistle to the Ephesians, 4[11]. "He (Jesus) gave some, apostles, and some, prophets, and other some, evangelists, and other some, pastors and doctors, for the perfecting of the saints, etc." Sometimes presbyters are united in one body, the *presbyterium*, which imposes hands that certain offices may be conferred (1 Tim., 4[14]). At the same time, the Apostle warns Timothy to preserve pure the deposit of truths he has entrusted to him (1 Tim., 6[20]; 2 Tim., 1[13, 14]) and to choose faithful co-laborers who may teach those truths to others (2 Tim., 2[2]). He claims for himself and also for Timothy and Titus the right of judging and condemning in matters of faith and discipline (1 Tim., 1[19], 5[19, 20], 6[3-5]; 2 Tim., 2[16-19], 4[2-4]; Tit., 3[10, 11]; 1 Cor., 5[1-5]).

Among the rites that are performed in Christian meetings, St. Paul mentions, besides Baptism, the Lord's Supper, the institution of which he relates almost in the same terms as the third Gospel (1 Cor., 11^{20-34}). The Eucharist is the body and blood of Jesus: it represents His death, and he who receives it unworthily eats and drinks his judgment. In another passage (1 Cor., 10^{16-21}), that same rite is placed side by side with the eating of meats offered to idols: thus, its relation to the sacrifice of the Cross, which had been already pointed out (1 Cor., $11^{25, 26}$), is set forth more vividly.

Marriage is the symbol of the union of Jesus with His Church. The wife is the body of her husband, as the Church is the body of Jesus (E., 5^{25-32}). Hence marriage cannot be dissolved: such is the Lord's command (1 Cor., $7^{10, 11}$); death alone shall break it (R., $7^{2, 3}$; 1 Cor., 7^{39}). The only exception to be made is in behalf of the believing party with whom the unbelieving refuses to dwell (1 Cor., 7^{12-16}). As to continence and virginity, Paul, following on his Master's footsteps, does not impose it: still, he does advise it, merely as preferable to the state of marriage, when one is called by God to it (1 Cor., $7^{7, 25-38}$). Likewise, the state of widowhood is to be preferred to a second marriage, though the latter is allowed (1 Cor., 7^{39-40}).

However, all through this teaching, we see now and then passing and repassing that anxious care about the judgment and the end of things, which the preaching of Jesus had so strongly inculcated: Paul, too, had preached the kingdom of God (Acts, 19^{9}, 20^{25}, 28^{31}) and he knew well that this kingdom would receive its completion only with the second coming of Christ. When would that consummation take place? Expressing on this point the current notion of the time, the Apostle described it, in his first letters, as near at hand (1 Th., 4^{14-16}; cf. 2 Th., 2^{2-5}): "The time is short," he exclaims, "we must use this world, as if we used it not, for its figure passes away" (1 Cor., 7^{29-31}). Still, at the same time he repeats that before the final parousia, the man of sin shall be revealed, the man of perdition (*ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας*), who shall rise against God and His dominion. Now, the mystery of iniquity is already going on; however, the Antichrist is not yet allowed full play; there is a power (ὁ κατέχων) that restrains him until it disappears and leaves him free in his course of action (2 Th., 2^{3-11}). Thus, as he advances in his career, the Apostle's thought becomes more distinct and complete. Instead of casting his eyes directly on the end of time, he turns them to the end of each individual and to his own. Though the fear of being deprived of our bodies, and found naked, disturbs us, still we should accept our destiny, since we are thus reunited to the Lord (2 Cor., 5^{1-8}). As to himself, he knows, when he writes his second letter to Timothy, that his dissolution is not far distant (2 Tim., $4^{6, 7}$), but this death shall be for him a gain, since it will place him with Christ (Ph., 1^{21-23}). St. Paul then believes that, immediately after this life, he will enjoy the sight and company of the Saviour, and he extends such a hope to all the faithful (2 Cor., 5^{1-8}).

Though, even then, he has not dismissed from his mind that end of time, the precise epoch of which he does not dare to point out, while he knows its circumstances, from the oral Evangelical teaching and from Jewish tradition. As he said already, the advent of Christ shall be preceded by the rise of a son of perdition, who shall seduce the nations, and, as far as he can, substitute himself for God (2 Th., 2^{3-11}). Then, in his turn, the Lord shall come down from heaven, at the voice of the Archangel and the sound of the trumpet (1 Th., 4^{15}, 1^{10}). Antichrist shall be exterminated (2 Th., 2^{8}); the dead shall rise again. From the principles of the Apostle, it would seem that such a resurrection should be reserved to the just, as it is the fruit of redemption (1 Cor., 15^{21-23}) and the consequence of the indwelling of the Holy Ghost within their souls (R., 8^{11}; cf. 1 Cor., 15^{23}; Ph., 3^{11}; 1 Th., 4^{14-16}). Still, St. Paul extends it to all, just and sinners (Acts, 24^{15}; 2 Cor., 5^{10}; cf. 1 Cor., 15^{21-22}), with this difference, however, that in the former, it shall be accompanied by a transfiguration and transformation of their bodies (1 Cor., 15^{35-54}). The last judgment shall follow. It shall be presided over by Jesus (2 Cor., 5^{10}; 2 Tim., 4^{1}), though it is the judgment of God, of God judging through Christ (R., $2^{5, 6, 16}$). The faithful also shall sit as judges (1 Cor., $6^{2, 3}$), although they are to be judged, like the rest of men (Acts, 17^{31}; 2 Cor., 5^{10}) and the Angels (1 Cor., 6^{3}). The sentence of that tribunal will render to every one according to his works, according to his guilt or his merit (R., 2^{5-13}). For, as a matter of fact, the Apostle clearly supposes, in the just, a merit properly so called, though he knows well that this merit is, at the same time, a gift of Heaven (R., 11^{35}; Ph., 2^{13}). Besides the transfiguration of their bodies, the just, then, will receive, for their fidelity, a share in the glory of God's children (R., 5^{2}, 8^{30}): their filiation will be manifestly shown (R., 8^{19}; cf. Col., 3^{4}). Reunited with Jesus, they shall inherit with Him the kingdom of the Father (R., 8^{17}) and possess eternal life (R., 2^{7}, 5^{21}; G., 6^{8}, etc.). St. Paul here pursues his parallel: dead with Jesus, risen with Him, the just are glorified with Him and partake of His supreme power. As to the destiny of the wicked, it will be a destiny of wrath, sorrow and anxiety, death and destruction (R., $2^{5, 8, 9}$, 6^{21}; 1 Th., 1^{10}; Ph., 3^{19}): they shall be assailed by the Lord and His power with an avenging fire (2 Th., 1^{7-9}). Their torments, as well as the happiness of the just, shall be everlasting (R., 2^{7}, 5^{21}, 6^{23}; 1 Cor., 9^{25}; G., 6^{28}; 1 Th., 4^{6}; 1 Tim., 1^{16}, 6^{12}; Tit., 1^{2}). In vain have some sought in St. Paul for the idea of a final restoration; it is not there.

There remains the last act of that supreme tragedy. Death, the last adversary of Jesus, has been destroyed by the resurrection (1 Cor., $15^{26, 54, 55}$). Having accomplished His work and conquered all His enemies, Christ, in His turn, hands over His kingdom and royalty to His Father and submits Himself to Him: God is all in all (1 Cor., 15^{24-28}).

From this mere summary it is easy to realize what developments the teaching of Jesus received at the hands of St. Paul. It is evidently to the anthropological and soteriological part of this teaching, to the part of Christ in the work of redemption that the Apostle turned his attention. He has strongly set forth, by a keen analysis of human corruption, the universal character of sin and the absolute necessity of restoration: so many points that had been sketched already in the Gospel. Jesus had given to understand that the Mosaic Law was only provisional: St. Paul defines more closely its function in the past and its actual ineffectiveness and cessation. To the Saviour's affirmations on the dignity of His person, he adds a few features which forecast, if they do not already express, the Johannine theology. He creates, so to speak, the whole theory of the doctrine of Redemption. In regard to the Church also and her internal organization he brings, in his Pastoral Epistles, new information. Even his eschatology is clearer than that of the Synoptists.

However — and this should be noticed — in all these developments, St. Paul follows Jesus closely, and aims only at explaining the Master's thought. When he gives advice in his own name, he carefully distinguishes it from the commands of the Lord (1 Cor., $7^{12, 15}$). If this distinction is seldom met with, it is simply because ordinarily he does but repeat the teaching he has received by means of a direct revelation (G., $1^{11, 12}$). He repeats it, but with the impress of his own mind upon it; he does not coldly recite a lesson learned by heart, rather he repeats the Master's doctrine as a doctrine which he has lived and made his own, and the depths of which his heart, as well as his mind, has lovingly fathomed.

As I have already observed, the Epistle to the Hebrews ought to be, because of its origin, examined apart from the Epistles of St. Paul. The aim of the author is to urge those to whom he writes to remain immovable in the belief they have accepted, by withdrawing them from a possible return to Judaism. To reach that aim, he endeavors to establish the superiority of the new economy by a comparison of the person, functions and work of Jesus with the person, functions and work of those who promulgated and ministered to the Old Law, whence he infers how firm should be our faith and our hope in the Christian life. It is then chiefly a Christology and a soteriology that he sets before us.

In His earthly manifestation, Jesus is, of course, truly man, of our race and of the tribe of Juda (2^{14}, 7^{14}), like unto us, barring sin, and therefore capable of having compassion on our infirmities (2^{17}, 4^{15}, 7^{26}), faithful, loving and obedient in regard to God ($3^{1, 2}$, $5^{7, 8}$): but this appearance is not all Jesus; He is also the Son, the first-born, the heir of all things, superior to the Angels who must adore Him, the *ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ* (*τοῦ θεοῦ*), without beginning and end of days. By Him the world was created and is preserved: He is God (1^{1-12}, 3^{6}, $7^{3, 8, 16, 28}$). Not all these features can be applied to Christ glorified after the resurrection: some are necessarily to be referred to Christ preëxisting. And granting that a Philonian influence can be here detected, still the doctrine of the Incarnation, which appears even in the second verse of the Epistle (cf. 10^{5}), and the theory of Redemption with which it is filled, show that the author has completely modified and stated with precision the uncertainty and principally cosmological concept of Philo. His thought obviously approaches the prologue of the fourth Gospel.

The Son of God has become our priest. As the whole Law whose centre it was, the Jewish priesthood had only a provisional character ($7^{11, 12, 18, 19}$) and was to be transferred. Jesus is our new high priest (4^{14}). The mediator of the new covenant (9^{15}, 12^{24}), He is a priest called by God ($4^{5, 6, 10}$): a priest in the likeness of Melchisedek (6^{20}–7^{17}; 5^{10}), superior to the priests of the Levitical order ($7^{1-11, 20-28}$), innocent and spotless (7^{26-28}), eternal and unique ($7^{23, 24}$).

The victim offered by this priest is He Himself (10^{7-10}, 7^{27}, $9^{11-15, 28}$), and it suffices to offer it once, so efficacious is this sacrifice (7^{27}, 9^{12}, $10^{10, 12, 14}$). By this one act, He redeems us (λύτρωσις, $9^{12, 15}$) and cleanses us, not from our legal impurities, as the rites of old did, but from our sins (1^{3}, $9^{14, 28}$, 10^{22}); watered by His blood, we are inwardly sanctified (12^{24}, 13^{12}), freed from Satan's dominion (2^{14}), capable of approaching the throne of mercy, and favored with the blessings of grace (10^{9}, 4^{6}, 12^{22-24}). Then, that sacrifice is offered for all men (2^{9}, 5^{9}, 9^{28}); its efficacy extends to all times ($9^{25, 26}$); nay, after being performed upon earth, it is perpetuated in the sanctuary of Heaven, where our high-priest has entered, carrying in His hands His own blood, and where He continues to intercede for us ($9^{11, 12, 24}$, 7^{25}).

Since, then, Jesus is the mediator of the new covenant, we must have confidence in Him ($10^{19, 23}$), and, to go to God, we must approach our Saviour with full faith (10^{21-22}). The author of the Epistle clearly defines what he understands by faith; he regards it as chiefly an act of the mind, the certain assurance of the things to be hoped for, the conviction of what we do not see (11^{1}). Faith has been the principle of all the heroic deeds we admire in the history of Israel (11). One ought to be careful not to disown that faith he has received from Jesus, for it is impossible for those who, after knowing the light and gift of God, have rejected them, to be renewed by penance, crucifying and mocking the Son of God (6^{4-8}): — a passage which does not mean that the way of repentance and forgiveness is for ever closed to the sinner or even the renegade, but only that they shall not find salvation outside Jesus and as long as they obstinately refuse to acknowledge His claims.

Faith and confidence, then, are the chief virtues recommended in the Epistle to the Hebrews; though the others, such as courage, fidelity to the Church, perseverance, are not excluded, any more than the duties of domestic and social life ($6^{10, 12}$, 10^{25}, $^{32-36}$, 12^{2-4}, 13^{1-7}); which we should practise, principally because of the future judgment. After passing through death, all have to undergo that judgment (9^{27}). The time is near, when Christ shall appear to save those that are waiting for Him (9^{28}, 11^{37}). Then, the just shall receive their reward, enjoy rest, the kingdom, a heavenly home, the heavenly Jerusalem ($4^{3, 10}$, 10^{35}, 11^{16}, $12^{21, 23, 28}$) and be happy for ever (5^{9}, $9^{12, 15}$, 12^{28}); while the loss of the wicked shall be terrible in the fire which will consume them ($10^{27, 31, 39}$). In chapter 6^{2}, the author mentions the resurrection of the flesh, but without stating precisely its conditions.

§ 4. — The Teaching of the Apostles besides St. Paul and St. John.[1]

Under this title, we have to sum up first of all, the doctrine of the discourses which, according to the *Acts*, the Apostles delivered in the days immediately after Pentecost, and then the doctrine of the Epistles that are ascribed neither to St. John nor to St. Paul. With them we may join also the narrative parts of the Gospels and the Acts, because these parts express chiefly the faith of those who wrote them.

As it is impossible to find in that collection of documents a common central idea, we must follow a conventional plan, on occasion of which we will insist, when this seems to be needed, on the special views of such or such a document.[2]

---

[1] Besides the general works above mentioned, cf. the special literature in Stevens, *Theology of the N. T.*, p. 596.

[2] All know that the authenticity of several of these documents has been called into question, and most various dates, proposed for their redaction. Here, of course, we cannot enter into the examination of such questions. It suffices for our purpose that, on the whole, these writings may be considered as an expression or a faithful echo of the Apostolic preaching in the second half of the 1st century.

On the Trinity in general, nothing is found that improves on the teaching of Jesus and St. Paul. The three Persons are clearly distinguished chiefly by St. Luke in the narrative of the baptism of Jesus (Matt., $3^{16, 17}$; Mark, $1^{10, 11}$; Luke $3^{21, 22}$).

Of the Holy Ghost, frequent mention is made. The Evangelists mention His coöperating in the miraculous birth of Jesus (Matt., 1^{20}; Luke, 1^{35}), and His descent upon Him at the time of His baptism (cf. above). The Acts tells us how, promised by the Saviour to the Apostles (1^{4}; cf. Luke, 24^{49}), He actually came down on them on the day of Pentecost (2^{4}; cf. $^{17, 18}$). His office is to strengthen faith (6^{5}), impart wisdom (6^{3}), guide the disciples in their ministry (8^{29}), inspire the new prophets (11^{28}, 13^{9}), as He inspired those of old (7^{51}), and grant the gift of tongues (2^{4}, 10^{44-47}). According to St. Peter, He is the source of grace and of the sanctification of the faithful (1 P., 1^{2}): to lie to him, is to lie to God (A., $5^{3, 4}$).

The discourses recorded in the Acts give us the oldest specimen of a defence of Christianity based upon the character of Jesus. That defence is very simple and consists merely in proving that Jesus is the promised Messias. He is the prophet announced by Moses, the servant of God, the παῖς θεοῦ of Isaias (A., $3^{13, 22-26}$, 4^{27}; cf. 4^{25}); He has fulfilled the prophecies (8^{32}, ff.); even His death was foretold; He is the cornerstone, that was rejected, spoken of in Ps. 117^{22} (4^{11}; cf. 4^{25-28}), the betrayed one mentioned in Ps. 68^{28} ($1^{16, 20}$), whose whole passion had been described beforehand and took place just as it should have taken place (2^{23}, 3^{18}, $4^{27, 28}$). In Ps. 15^{10}, David had announced His resurrection (3^{15}, 4^{10} , 5^{30}, 10^{40}), as well as His ascension and exaltation to Heaven, in Ps. 109^{1} (2^{33-36}).

Of the sacrifice of Jesus, scarcely anything is said. However, the first Epistle of St. Peter contains the notion of the *substitutio vicaria* (2^{24}) and of our redemption through the Saviour's blood ($1^{18, 19}$). On the contrary, the fact of His resurrection holds a prominent place in the early Apostolic teaching, because this is for the Jews the decisive proof of His being the Messias. After going down to hell there to preach to the spirits of the dead (1 P., $3^{19, 20}$, 4^{6}), the risen Christ ascends to the right hand of His Father (Mark, 16^{19}). There He shall reign forever (2 P., 1^{11}; cf. Luke, $1^{32, 33}$), for God made Him Christ glorious and Lord (Acts, 2^{36}). The name of *κύριος* becomes His name and is added to that of Jesus (Acts, $11^{23, 24}$, 1^{21}; cf. ^{24}; 4^{29}; 2 P., $1^{2, 8, 11, 14, 16}$); Jesus is the only Ruler and Lord (Jud., 4^{8}); to Him are applied the texts written of God Himself in the Old Testament (Acts, $2^{20, 21}$, 7^{59}), and adoration is paid (Matt., $28^{9, 17}$).

Faith is the condition of salvation, and at the same time that the Apostles require repentance, they demand also that faith should be given to their words (Acts, $2^{38, 41}$, 3^{19}, 5^{31}, $8^{12, 14, 22}$). — This reminds us of the opposition which some pretended existed between the views of St. Paul on justification by faith and those of St. James. Such an opposition does not exist. No more than St. Paul ascribes justification to a faith merely speculative, that would not be accompanied by an interior disposition of obedience and charity, does St. James ascribe it to works that would not be vivified by faith and charity. All the doctrine of the latter Apostle is summed up in chapter 2^{22} of his Epistle: the faith of Abraham coöperated with his works, and through them was brought to perfection. The faith that prompts us to act is the only true faith; any other kind is dead and unprofitable. Faith isolated and theoretical, then, does not save us, any more than works without faith do, but faith accompanied with works (Jas., 2^{14-26}). — As to the Mosaic Law, different views first arose in the primitive Church, in regard to its obligatory value for the Gentiles. These were beginning to enter the true fold: at Antioch, they formed already an independent community (Acts, 11^{20-26}). Once they had become Christians, were they to be subjected to the legal prescriptions of Judaism? (Acts, 15^{5-11}) — a question which

Peter solved in the negative (Acts, 15^{7-11}), after receiving divine indications on the occasion of the conversion of the centurion Cornelius (Acts, $10^{10-20, 28, 34, 35, 44-48}$). James spoke in the same sense (Acts, 15^{13-20}). However, all uncertainty was not removed, and a doubt arose as to whether or not the converts from Judaism could associate with those from Paganism and thus transgress the Law. We find an echo of these scruples in the Epistle to the Galatians (2^{11-14}). Though Peter considered such relations perfectly legitimate, still he had a moment of weakness and was rebuked for it by St. Paul. It is only later on that the Epistle to the Hebrews was to proclaim the definitive extinction of the Old Law and its being replaced by the New.

As to the other parts of Christian Ethics, it would be manifestly too long to extract all its features from that literature which is mostly exhortatory. Therein we find recommended submission to civil authorities and immediate masters, if one is a servant (1 P., $2^{13, 14, 18}$), confident prayer (Jas., 1^{1}). St. James seems to forbid any kind of oath (Jas., 5^{12}) and reproduces (Jas., $1^{14, 15}$) the genealogy *concupiscence, sin, death,* met with in St. Paul. The latter's energetic protest against the flesh reappears, too, in St. Jude (23), who regards the body as a stained tunic to be utterly disliked. The Acts mentions fasting as one of the Church practices ($13^{2, 3}$, 14^{22}).

The Church: such is, in fact, the name given by the Acts, which is its earliest history, to the gathering of the first faithful (5^{11}, 8^{1-3}). Among these there is a kind of community of goods, prompted and maintained by spontaneous charity alone (Acts, $2^{44, 45}$, $5^{3, 4}$). Moreover, in that Christian people, which generally forms a holy, a royal priesthood (*ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον, βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα*), and must offer up spiritual victims (1 P., $2^{5, 9}$), there exists a hierarchy. The Apostles reserve to themselves, as their own functions, prayer and the *διακονία τοῦ λόγου* (Acts, $6^{2, 4}$). Peter evidently appears as the first of them (Acts, $1^{13, 15}$, $2^{14, 37}$, $3^{6, 12}$, 4^{8}, $5^{3, 29}$, 15^{7}). They impose hands on the deacons and new converts (Acts, 8^{17}). Under them, we find in every community, the *πρεσβύτεροι*, whose duty it is to rule the flock entrusted to them (Acts, 11^{30}, 14^{22}, $15^{2, 6, 22, 23}$, 16^{4}, 21^{18}; 1 P., $5^{1, 2}$). With the Apostles the presbyters decide on what may be required in the question of legal observances, and with them, present their decision as that of the Holy Spirit (Acts, $15^{6, 22, 28}$). Then, in the Church of Jerusalem, we find deacons, instituted with prayer and imposition of hands, whose function is, at first, to take care of the poor (Acts, 6^{1-6}), and whom we see later on dispute with the Jews, baptize and preach (Acts, 6^{9}, $8^{38, 40}$). At Antioch, we meet with prophets and teachers, *διδάσκαλοι*, who impose their hands on Paul and Barnabas (Acts, $13^{1, 3}$). In fine, mention is made of *νεώτεροι*, who must obey the presbyters: whether they fulfilled a distinct function or not, is uncertain (Acts, $5^{6, 10}$; 1 P., 5^{5}).

It is through Baptism that one enters into the Church (Acts, 2^{41}, $10^{47, 48}$). Together with penance, it is the condition of salvation (Acts, 2^{38}); it presupposes faith (Acts, 8^{36-38}) and is administered in the name of Jesus (*ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ*, Acts, 2^{38}, 10^{48}, 8^{16}). Its effect is to remit sins (Acts, 2^{38}; cf. 10^{43}), and cleanse us from our faults through the blood of Jesus, in the sprinkling of which it consists (1 P., 1^{2}, 3^{18-21}).

Baptism is ordinarily followed by the imposition of hands for the communication of the Holy Ghost (Acts, $8^{17, 19}$, $19^{5, 6}$): sometimes, though, this effusion takes place outside the rite, and often is accompanied by the gift of tongues and various charisms (Acts, 10^{44-46}, 19^{6}). Then, in the Christian community, the breaking of bread is celebrated (Acts, $2^{42, 46}$, 20^{11}). As to the Apostles of the second generation, Paul and Barnabas, and the deacons, it is, as we have said, by the imposition of hands and the prayer either of the first Apostles or of the prophets and teachers, that they receive their mission (Acts, 6^{6}, 13^{1-3}).

In fine, to these rites must be added the one that St. James recommends in case of sickness. Is any Christian sick? The presbyters of the Church shall be brought in, who shall pray over him, while anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. That trustful prayer shall relieve the sick man, and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him (Jas., $5^{14, 15}$).

We have still to examine the eschatological teaching of our documents. It does not differ much from that of Jesus or St. Paul, but it is difficult to connect together its various elements. Though there is uncertainty in regard to the precise epoch of the end of the world, and though St. Peter's second Epistle insinuates that it may be quite distant (2 P., $3^{8, 9}$), still the prevalent sentiment is that it is near and that we ought to prepare for it (Acts, $2^{15, 21}$; 1 P., 4^{7}; Jas., $5^{8, 9}$). With the Messias, the last times have come (Acts, $2^{16, 17}$): — a thought which must frighten the wicked and strengthen the just (Jas., 5^{1-9}). These last times shall be marked by the apparition of lying teachers and wayward sects, that will deny the Lord Jesus and give up themselves to the corruption of their hearts (2 P., $2^{1-3, 12, 20}$, $3^{3, 4}$). But God, who judges the living and the dead, and who has already punished in hell the bad angels (2 P., 2^{4}) shall render to every one according to his works (1 P., 4^{5}). The just shall enjoy everlasting life (1 P., 3^{22}; Jude, ^{21}). Sometimes their final state is represented as an inheritance (1 P., 1^{4}; Jas., 2^{5}), other times too, as a reward, the crown of life granted to those who have courageously suffered (Jas., 1^{12}); a felicity that is to last for ever (1 P., 1^{4}, 3^{22}). On the contrary, the wicked shall disappear (1 P., 4^{18}) and be lost (*ἀπώλεια*, 2 P., 3^{7}); they shall be punished by the fire that shall devour them, as it did Sodom and Gomorrha (2 P., 2^{6}; Jude, $^{7, 8}$). Then a universal conflagration shall dissolve the earth, the actual heavens and the elements; new heavens and a new earth where justice shall dwell, shall appear; this is the object of our expectation (2 P., 3^{7-13}).

§ 5. — The Teaching of St. John.[1]

The exposition of the teaching of Jesus in the fourth Gospel is, at least, a partial exposition of St. John's teaching, for the disciple has so well marked with his own stamp the discourses of the Master, that he has made them his own by the tone and terminology he ascribes to them. We hear the author in the words he relates. But, leaving aside these discourses, we have still, as sources of the doctrine strictly Johannean, besides the narrative portions of the Gospel, the Epistles attributed to the Apostle, and the Apocalypse. All know the difficulties raised against these writings: especially the last has been, since the early times of the Church, the object of suspicions, and even keen criticisms.[2] We will not enter here into the discussion of these difficulties. Many have thought, on the contrary, that the Apocalypse bears the stamp of St. John, and therein is contained in germ the theology which was to be developed in the Epistles and in the Gospel. Whatever the value of such an opinion may be, it is quite proper first to present apart the teachings of the Apocalypse, because of their special character: notwithstanding the new spirit and the mystical points of view to be found in them, they are still connected with Judaism and its forms.

All these teachings centre around Christology and eschatology. However, God also and His Angels are, in them, the object of special attention. The former is not so much looked upon as a Father, as considered in His attributes of majesty and omnipotence. He is the Eternal, the Alpha and

---

[1] Besides the general works mentioned above, cf. the special literature in STEVENS, *The Theology of the N. T.*, pp. 595, 596; and also A. LOISY, *Le quatrième Evangile*, Paris, 1903; TH. CALMES, *L'Evangile selon Saint Jean*, Paris, 1904; SANDAY, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, 1905; LEPIN, *Valeur historique du quatrième Evangile*, Paris, 1909.

[2] EUSEB., *Eccl. Hist.*, VII, 25.

Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last (1^{8}, 21^{6}, 22^{13}), *παντοκράτωρ* (1^{8}, 4^{8}, etc.), creator of the universe by His free will alone (4^{11}, 10^{6}, 14^{7}).—Near Him is Jesus. Though the Apocalypse seems to assign Him an inferior part in regard to the Father (1^{1}, $2^{26, 27}$), yet it raises Him very high in the glory of His triumph, and finally associates Him completely to the Father in some attributes it ascribes to Him, and in the homage it describes as paid to Him. Thus the Son of Man is judge and Lord ($1^{16, 20}$), the prince of the kingdoms of the earth, the Lord of Lords and King of Kings (1^{5}, 17^{14}). On one hand, He is the faithful witness and the Amen (1^{5}, $3^{4, 14}$), the first begotten of the dead, who has the keys of death and of hell ($1^{5, 18}$), the principle of God's creation (*ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ*, 3^{14}); on the other, He is, like the Father, the first and the last (*ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος*, 1^{17}, 2^{8}), associated with God in the same praise and honors ($5^{12, 13}$), always placed close to Him and joined with Him (6^{16}, $7^{9, 10}$, 11^{15}, 12^{10}, 14^{4}, 21^{22}, 22^{3}).

It is under the figure of a lamb immolated that Jesus appears to the seer: by this lamb, through its blood, we have been redeemed in a redemption which has been universal (5^{9}; cf. 14^{4}, 5^{2}, 11^{6}); in its blood our sins have been washed (1^{5}, 7^{14}, 22^{14}). The death of Jesus is thus pointed out as the condition of our reconciliation, and the root of salvation.

Then, under Jesus, we find the Angels. They play in the Apocalypse, as they ordinarily do in writings of this kind, a considerable part which it is useless for us to analyze in detail. Though we must mention especially the seven spirits (*πνεύματα*) that stand before the throne of God (1^{4}), and are identified with the seven lamps burning before the throne (4^{5}) and with the seven eyes of the Lamb (1^{6}). In chapter $1^{4, 5}$, they are named between God and Jesus, and apparently each one of them speaks, one after the other, in the letters sent to the Churches ($2^{7, 11, 17, 29}$, $3^{6, 13, 22}$). On the other hand, mention is made of the Spirit who speaks (14^{13}) and yearns, with the Bride, for the coming of Jesus (22^{17}). Perhaps we have in these seven spirits a symbolical personification of the manifold action of the Holy Ghost, and in all these passages taken together, an outline of the Johannean pneumatology (John, 14–16).

Over against good Angels, the demon appears. He is represented under the shape of a dragon (12^{3}; cf. 12^{9}), the ancient serpent (of Genesis) called the devil and Satan, and seduces the whole world (12^{9}). The enemy of God, he too has his angels ($12^{7,\,9}$), a throne (2^{13}), a synagogue (2^{9}, 3^{9}) a doctrine with mysteries (*τὰ βαθέα τοῦ Σατανᾶ*, 2^{24}). Defeated by Michael and his Angels and precipitated from Heaven ($12^{7,\,8}$), he wars against the children of God, and is helped in this work by the two beasts, which respectively personify corrupting and persecuting iniquity ($13^{1\text{-}17}$).

Still, God and His justice shall triumph, and this triumph will constitute the end of things. The eschatological visions of Patmos contain many elements and images borrowed from Jewish Apocalypses that were being circulated when it was composed, and as far as this is concerned, these visions are little original. But, on the other hand, they have exercised too great an influence on subsequent ecclesiastical Eschatology, to be neglected. Hence it may be profitable to point out at least their connection.

First comes the fall of the Babylon that murdered and persecuted the Saints; this is the first victory of the Lamb (17, 18), whose wedding has arrived, and whose bride gets ready ($19^{7,\,9}$). Then the Word of God appears, on horseback, as a warrior, His robe stained with blood, and followed by the armies of Heaven ($19^{11\text{-}15}$). Against Him gather the beast, the false prophet, the kings and the mighty, enemies of His rule, with their troops ($19^{17\text{-}19}$). The beast and the false prophet are seized and cast alive into a lake of fire and sulphur; the others are killed, and their flesh eaten up by the birds of the air ($19^{17, 18, 20, 21}$); Satan is bound captive and relegated for a thousand years to the abyss (20^{1-3}).

Then takes place a first resurrection for the just only. They come back to life, and with Christ whose priests they are, reign for a thousand years (20^{4-6}).

That reign of a thousand years is followed by another trial. Freed for a while from his jail, Satan seduces the nations of the four corners of the world, and they come together and besiege the holy city (20^{7-8}; cf. 20^{3}). But then God Himself intervenes. Fire from Heaven destroys the rebels; Satan is sent to the lake of fire and sulphur, there to share the fate of the beast and pseudoprophet, and be tormented with them forever ($20^{9, 10}$), and a second resurrection, this one universal and followed by a judgment universal too ($20^{12, 13}$), prepares the definitive triumph of justice. It is according to his works (*κατὰ τὰ ἔργα*) written down in the books of Heaven, that everybody shall be judged ($20^{12, 13}$, 2^{23}, 22^{12}). The consequence of this judgment is for any one whose name is not found in the book of life, "death" and "hell," "the second death," viz., the condemnation to the lake of fire and sulphur that has already received the beast, the false prophet and the dragon ($20^{14, 15}$, 21^{8}). There are precipitated the fearful, unbelieving, abominable, murderers, whoremongers, sorcerers, idolaters and all liars (21^{8}; cf. 22^{15}). Besides, the punishment is analogous to the crimes committed (16^{6}, 13^{10}, 2^{20-23}, $18^{6, 7}$); moreover it is eternal, (20^{10}): nowhere is restoration mentioned (*ἀποκάταστασις*).

For the just, on the contrary, a new earth and new heavens shall be created, for the old ones have already disappeared (21^{1}; cf. 20^{11}). A new Jerusalem, the bride of the Lamb, comes down from Heaven, magnificent and splendidly clad, of which a description is given to us ($21^{11, 27}$). This is the Church triumphant, the definitive *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*, in which the Saints shall reign for ever with God and behold His face ($21^{3, 4}$, $22^{4, 5}$).

Now, we may pass to the doctrine of St. John's Gospel and Epistles.

"God is light, and in him there is no darkness" (1 J., 1^{5}). "God is love" (1 J., $4^{8, 16}$). These are the two definitions of God which St. John gives us, and which tend to represent Him as the source of all purity, holiness and life, for, according to the Apostle, darkness is the Evil (1 J., $1^{6, 7}$). The love of God for us has shown itself, chiefly in this, that He has sent into the world His only-begotten Son, that in Him we might have life (1 J., 4^{9}). — Who is this only-begotten Son? He is *the Son* simply and by way of preëminence (1 J., 2^{22-24}), the "Only-begotten" (J., $1^{14, 18}$): the Word. The term λόγος — which is already found in the Apocalypse — is directly or indirectly borrowed from Platonic Philosophy and especially from Philo; but the Apostle fills it with a meaning of which it did not admit, and the Word becomes a person, which He was not before. Jesus is then the true Word, the creating Word, by whom all things were made (J., 1^{3}), the revealing Word, light of the world (J., 1^{9}), the Word who from the beginning (*ἐν ἀρχῇ*) was near God (*πρὸς τὸν θεόν*) in the bosom of the Father, and who was God ($1^{1, 2, 18}$), and became incarnate and came into this world with real flesh (J., 1^{14}; 1 J., $4^{2, 3}$, $5^{1, 6-8, 12}$; 2 J., $^{7-12}$).

His work here below has been to communicate to us the life that is in Him (1 J., 1^{2}, 3^{14}, $5^{11, 20}$) and therefore first to blot out our sins and dissolve in us the works of the Evil Spirit (1 J., $3^{5, 8}$). Hence Jesus had to die, not only for the nation of Israel, but also for all the dispersed children of God (J., $11^{51, 52}$), that He might be a propitiation for our sins (*ἱλασμός*), and purify us through His blood (1 J., 1^{7}, 2^{2}, 4^{10}).

However, the world has not responded to that grace of the Father through Jesus. In St. John, the world is sometimes simply the whole of created things (J., $1^{9, 10}$), more often the whole of the powers which oppose upon earth the dominion of God. This whole world lies in wickedness (1 J., 5^{19}), and all that is found therein is nothing but pride and concupiscence (1 J., 2^{16}). Its proper work is sin, iniquity (*ἀνομία*, 1 J., 3^{4}, 5^{17}). Here sin is not a passing transgression of God's will: it is the state of habitual opposition to His laws; and hence he that is born of God and preserves this filiation does not sin, nay, cannot sin (1 J., $3^{9, 10}$, 5^{18}), just as he that abides in Jesus (1 J., 3^{6}). On the other hand, however, the Apostle distinguishes sins that are and sins that are not, *ad mortem* (*πρὸς θάνατον*, *μὴ πρὸς θάνατον*, 1 J., $5^{16, 17}$). For the former, we ought not to intercede; for the latter, we may do so, and life will be granted. It is probably for these, that, according to St. John, we have near the Father an advocate, Jesus (1 J., 2^{1}).

True Christians, then, will be solicitous to detest the world and triumph over it by faith (1 J., 2^{15}, $5^{4, 5}$), and also to sanctify themselves, according to the pattern of God Himself, that they may become like Him and behold Him as He is, when He reveals Himself (*καθὼς ἐστιν*, 1 J., $3^{2, 3}$).

This short sketch of the Johannean Theology must be completed, as has been already observed, by what has been said of the teaching of Jesus according to the fourth Gospel. The theology of St. John marks the highest point of religious revelation in the New Testament. In the Synoptists, the words of Jesus are found conditioned by the quality of His hearers and must be confined, most of the time, within the horizon of Jewish thought. Of course, they extend infinitely beyond that horizon, but without modifying the general outline of that horizon, without rendering it strange, unfamiliar to those who listen to Him. St. Paul does away, at least partially, with the altogether Palestinian mold of that first teaching. As the Apostle of the Gentiles and of the Dispersion, he must adapt it to the Hellenistic Jews and to the Greeks, and therefore suppress or soften the features that might make it unintelligible.

But in St. John (we mean the Gospel and the Epistles), this work is pushed much further. When he writes, the Church has advanced far beyond the countries in which she was born, and she must adopt new modes of thought and speech, if she wishes to be understood and friendly received. A few adaptations of details would not suffice: it is a full translation and interpretation of the doctrinal data of the Synoptists, that becomes necessary. Jewish particularism and symbolism are to be definitively discarded; instead, the universality of the Gospel religion is to be proclaimed, the divine realities therein contained to be searched and studied, the love of God and the dignity of Jesus to be plainly and unhesitatingly displayed in their infinite grandeur. God is Spirit, and He must be adored in spirit. The Messias of the Jews, the Anointed of the Lord, is the Word of God, God eternal as the Father, incarnate and made man. The salvation He brings us is the very life of God which He comes to communicate to us and which, if developed in us and by us, will make us like unto the Father and able to see Him even as He is. This is, in a few words, the translation St. John gives of the Master's preaching: — a translation which is to become henceforth the expression of the new faith. Christian Antiquity has called the disciple whom Jesus loved *the Theologian*, and rightly so: for St. John — besides being an inspired writer and an organ of divine revelation — is also the first, in the order of time, and, most probably the greatest, theologian of the Church.

CHAPTER III

THE TESTIMONY OF THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS [1]

§ 1. — Preliminary Remarks.

THE title of "Apostolic Fathers" is given to the ecclesiastical writers who lived at the end of the first or during the first half of the second century, and are supposed to have received from the Apostles or their immediate disciples the teaching they transmit. Writers not inspired and inferior, in depth of views, to the authors of the New Testament, they are inferior too, in richness of doctrine and power of reflection, to those who came after them. They are witnesses of belief far more than theologians. If we except St. Ignatius, whose mind is more original, their great value comes chiefly from their antiquity. Moreover, their works belong chiefly to the hortatory kind of literature: often, they are writings composed merely for the occasion, letters on religious and Christian themes, which do not pretend at all to treat these in a didactic and complete manner.

---

[1] The aim of this work being to expose the *Doctrine* of the authors of whom we are treating, and not to set forth their lives and deeds, the reader will not find here a strictly so called biographical or bibliographical account. Information of this kind, which we suppose already acquired, is to be found in authors of Patrologies and in historians of ancient ecclesiastical literature, such as NIRSCHL, FESSLER-JUNGMANN, BARDENHEWER [English transl.], BATIFFOL, HARNACK, KRÜGER, KRUMBACHER, EHRHARD, EBERT, etc. (See a list of them, with the exact title of their works in BARDENHEWER, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Litteratur*, vol. I, Friburg in Brisgau, 1902, pp. 16, ff.). We will, for each one of the authors to be examined, merely mention the edition referred to in this volume and point out the best and most recent studies on his theology. — Krüger's work has been also translated into English.

These Apostolic Fathers, eight in number, may be ranged from a geographical standpoint, in the following order: at Rome, the first Epistle of St. Clement (93–97) and the *Shepherd* of Hermas (about 140–155); at Rome or at Corinth, the homily called the second Epistle of St. Clement (about 150); at Antioch and along the shores of Asia Minor, the seven Epistles of St. Ignatius (107–117); at Smyrna, the Epistle of St. Polycarp and his *Martyrium* (the latter, about 155–156); at Hierapolis in Phrygia, the fragments of Papias (about 150); perhaps in Palestine, the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (in its actual form, about 131–160, according to Harnack; in its whole, about the end of the first century, according to Funk, Zahn and Batiffol); finally, probably in Egypt, the (apocryphal) Epistle of St. Barnabas (130–131, according to Harnack).[1]

The source from which these documents draw their teaching, and the authority on which they intend to base it, is first of all the Old Testament. For them it is the Scripture by way of preëminence (ἡ γραφή, γέγραπται),[2] the holy word (ὁ ἅγιος λόγος).[3] But an equal authority is ascribed to the words of Jesus,[4] and St. Ignatius, placing the Gospel on the same level as the Prophets, quotes it also under the head of γέγραπται (*Phila.*, 8^2; cf. *Smyrn.*, 7^2). As to the Apostles, St. Ignatius too considers them as the masters of the belief of the Church, the *presbyterium* of the Eternal Father, with which we ought to remain united.[5] The *Teaching of the Apostles* is entitled Διδαχὴ κυρίου διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων, and we find in the works we are now examining more or less explicit quotations of almost all the Apostolic writings of the New Testament. This does not mean that the Apostolic Fathers had already a determined canon of the New Testament — as a matter of fact, we find in them some quotations, though in small number, from apocryphal books[1] —, but that they regarded the words of the Apostles, as well as those of Jesus, in the texts which, as they thought, recorded them, as a decisive authority establishing irrefutably doctrine and faith.

---

[1] Cf. the editions in BARDENHEWER, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 67. — The edition here referred to is the second edition of FUNK, *Patres Apostolici*, Tübingen, 1901.

[2] 1 *Clem.*, 4^1, 39^3, 35^7, etc.; IGNAT., *Magnes.*, 12, etc.; *Barn.*, 4^7.

[3] 1 *Clem.*, 13^3.

[4] Γέγραπται (*Barn.*, 4^{14}); ἑτέρα γραφή (2 *Clem.*, 2^4); ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς εἴρηται (POLYC., *Philipp.*, 12^1).

[5] *Magn.*, 6^1; *Trall.*, 2^2, $3^{1,3}$; *Rom.*, 4^3, etc.

Moreover, these words of the Apostles, or at least the echo of their words, were supposed to be contained elsewhere than in the written documents. It is well-known that Papias placed, side by side with, and even above the written tradition, the oral tradition of those who had conversed with the Apostles and the elders.[2] Several of the quotations made by the Apostolic Fathers do not come from our canonical books[3]: perhaps the substance of these quotations had been transmitted to them by memory. Finally the idea of an ecclesiastical doctrinal authority, of a living teaching, more elastic and supple than the words merely related of Jesus and the Apostles, and, like these, imposing itself, appears in St. Ignatius, and perhaps, too, even in St. Clement. The latter appeals to "the glorious and venerable rule of our tradition" (1 *Clem.*, 7^2); the former affirms that no Christian can more lawfully separate himself from the bishop than from God, Jesus and the Apostles (*Trall.*, 6^1–7^1). "Children of truth, flee divisions and false doctrines; but where your shepherd is, there do ye, as sheep, follow after" (*Phila.*, 2^1).

The Old Testament with a few apocryphals, the words and writings of Jesus and the Apostles, oral tradition, one or two apocryphal documents of the New Testament, the teaching of the bishop: these, then, are the sources from which the doctrine of the Apostolic Fathers is derived.

---

[1] *Gospel of the Egypt.*, in 2 *Clem.*, 4^5, 5^4, 12^2; *Doctrine of Peter*(?) in St. Ignatius, *Smyrn.*, 3^2.

[2] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, III, 39, 4.

[3] Cf. v. g., 1 *Clem.*, 13^2; also Hermas, *Similit.* 8, 8^1; 2 *Clem.*, 8^5; *Barn.*, 6^{13}.

What is this doctrine? — This question we shall answer, by taking up, one after the other, because of their importance, each one of them.

§ 2.—The First Epistle of St. Clement.[1]

The very aim which St. Clement intended in his Epistle, viz., to restore in the Church of Corinth peace and obedience to legitimate pastors, explains easily why teachings on the authority of the leaders of the Church and moral exhortations are predominant therein. Nevertheless, we find in it dogmatic elements, few indeed, but worth gathering, contained as they are in such an ancient writing.

God's kindness and mercy are often set forth ($19^{2,3}$, 23^{1}, 29^{1}), and His power also ($27^{4,5}$). We may remark too the great number of doxologies which separate the author's developments (20^{12}, 32^{4}, 38^{4}, 43^{6}, etc.). Then, near God, we find the person of Jesus, of whom more will be said later on, and the Holy Spirit. It was under the influence of this Spirit that the sacred authors spoke (8^{1}, 45^{2}), and it is under His influence also (*διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*) that the author of the Epistle declares he is writing (63^{2}); but the Holy Spirit Himself is but the instrument of Jesus, speaking to us in the Old Testament ($22^{1, \text{ff.}}$). Two trinitarian formulas, of unequal value, sum up St. Clement's teaching on this mystery. In Chapter 46^{6}, he tells us that we have "but one God, one Christ, one Spirit of grace poured out upon us all, one calling in Christ." In Chapter 58^{2}, comes the formula of oath: *ζῇ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς, καὶ ζῇ ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἥ τε πίστις καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν, ὅτι κτλ.* ("For as God liveth, and the Lord Jesus Christ liveth, and the Holy Spirit, the Faith and the Hope of the elect . . ."). If we place this formula side by side with the formula of the Old Testament, *ζῇ κύριος* (1 Kings, 14^{39}, 20^{3}, 26^{16}, etc.), we see that, for Clement, *κύριος* decomposes itself into *ὁ θεός*, *ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*, *τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*, these three terms being invoked together as tokens of his word.[1]

---

[1] A. BRÜLL, *Der erste Brief des Clemens von Rom*, Friburg, 1882; WREDE, *Untersuchungen über den ersten Clemensbrief*, Göttingen, 1891; G. COURTOIS, *L'Epître de Clément de Rome*, Montauban, 1894; BANG, *Studien über den Clemensbrief*, *Theolog. Studien und Kritiken*, vol. LXXI, 1898; J. GREGG, *The Epistle of St. Clement*, London, 1899; A. STAHL, *Patristische Untersuchungen*, Leipsic, 1901; A. SCHERER, *Der erste Clemensbrief an die Corinther*, Ratisbon, 1902; D. VÖLTER, *Die apostolischen Väter neu undersucht*, I, Leyden, 1904; R. SOHM, *Kirchenrecht*, I, Leipsic, 1892; H. HEMMER, *Clément de Rome*, Paris, 1909 (in the series *Textes et Documents*).

Jesus comes from Abraham *κατὰ σάρκα* (32^{2}); He is God's servant (*παῖς θεοῦ*, 59^{2-4}, liturgical formulas), but also His Son (*υἱός*, 36^{4}). In Chapter 36^{2-5}, Clement, quoting the Epistle to the Hebrews (1^{3-13}), raises Jesus above the Angels, and represents Him as the splendor of divine majesty, begotten of God, sitting at His right hand. We would believe that he calls Him even God (*παθήματα αὐτοῦ*, viz., *θεοῦ*, 2^{1}), if we would abide by the reading of the oldest MS., the *Alexandrinus*, a reading adopted by Harnack. The MS. of Constantinople and the Latin and Syriac translations give *αὐτοῦ* = *Χριστοῦ*.

The part of Jesus is to save us. He has given His blood for us, His flesh for our flesh, His soul for our souls (49^{6}; cf. 31^{6}). Through this blood the redemption of all has been wrought (*λύτρωσις*, 12^{7}); to all the grace of repentance, offered (7^{4}). Jesus is then our salvation, the pontiff of our offerings, the advocate of our weaknesses (36^{1}), our high-priest (64). Through Him we give glory to God and pray to Him (58^{2}, 64, 61^{3}), but He Himself too must be honored (*ἐντραπῶμεν*, 21^{6}).

---

[1] A similar formula is found in the *Assumption of Isaias*, 3^{13}.

The work of Jesus is continued by the Apostles. They are the messengers of Jesus as He is the messenger of God: *Ὁ Χριστὸς οὖν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι απὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ· ἐγένοντο οὖν ἀμφότερα εὐτάκτως ἐκ θελήματος θεοῦ* ($42^{1, 2}$: "Christ therefore was sent by God, the Apostles by Christ: so both were orderly sent, according to the will of God"). In their turn the Apostles establish overseers and deacons (42^{4}), then decide that others, after themselves, shall inherit their office (44^{2}). Elsewhere, mention is made of *πρεσβύτεροι* (1^{3}, 21^{6}, 44^{5}, 54^{2}, 57^{2}), whom the author seems to identify with the overseers ($44^{1, 4, 5}$). Against this confusion, the passage of chapter 40^{5}, has been invoked, in which Clement distinguishes the high-priest (*ἀρχιερεύς*), the priests (*ἱερεῖς*) and the levites (*λευΐται*): but this passage refers not to the Christian hierarchy, but to the Jewish. On the other hand, overseers and presbyters are described as presenting the offerings, *ὁσίως προςενέγκοντας τὰ δῶρα* (44^{4}): hence they fulfilled strictly liturgical functions. In keeping with the aim of his letter, the author often returns to the obligation of obeying those who command (1^{3}), the guides of our souls (63^{1}), the presbyters (47^{6}, 54^{2}, 57^{1}). It is a grievous sin to deprive them, without any sufficient reason, of the exercise of their office, as the Corinthians have done ($44^{3, 4, 6}$, 47^{6}); on the contrary, they must be honored (1^{3}; cf. 3^{3}, 21^{6}).

The root of the dissensions existing in the Corinthian Church is envy. St. Clement opposes it vigorously (3^{4}–6): he is unwilling to suffer any division in the body of Christ (46^{6}), and therefore he insists everywhere on the practice of humility, meekness and obedience, and pays to charity a magnificent tribute of praise (49). God gives to all men, He has given even to those who lived before us, the facility of repentance: we can always do penance and obtain the forgiveness of our sins ($7^{5\text{-}7}$; cf. $8^{2, 5}$). — As to the principle of justification, we find, in the Epistle now under our consideration, the two currents of thought represented by St. Paul and by St. James. Sometimes, the author states with the former that the Elect have obtained their glory neither by themselves nor by their works, even when these were good, but by the will of God, and that thus, called in Christ by the same will, we are not justified by our works, but by faith, in which God has, from the beginning, justified all men ($32^{3,4}$); — sometimes too, when he proceeds to give practical rules of conduct, he insists, on the contrary, on the necessity of good works and virtuous deeds (33^1, 35^2); Abraham was blessed, because he fulfilled, through faith, justice and truth (31). Here St. Clement takes the same point of view as St. James, and regards as inefficacious, faith without works.

Then, to encourage the Corinthians in their endeavors at doing good, he sets before their eyes the thought of the final retribution. There will be a judgment (28^1), and God shall treat every one according to his deeds (34^3). The reward of the just will be the expansion of the blessings brought to us by grace here below, and particularly of the *ζωὴ ἐν ἀθανασίᾳ* (35^2; cf. 36^2). As St. Paul, whose martyrdom is mentioned as well as that of St. Peter (5^{3-7}), they will go to the holy place (*εἰς τὸν ἅγιον τόπον*, 5^7), to the place reserved for the just, and when God's kingdom takes place (*ἐν τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ*), they will be manifested (50^3). Moreover, Clement formally teaches the resurrection of the flesh which he bases not merely on the authority of Scripture and the example of Jesus, but also on analogies drawn from natural facts (24–26^3).

In fine, we may give a special mention to chapters 59–61, in as much as they supply us with an invaluable specimen of liturgical prayer at the end of the first century.

§ 3. — Hermas' Shepherd.[1]

Hermas' *Shepherd* is chiefly a work of edification: "a vast examination of conscience of the Roman Church," the aim of which is to point out the spiritual relaxations that take place in her midst, and to present, in penance, the remedy that will cure them. Penance: — such is then, properly speaking, the subject of the work. The other doctrines are set forth only incidentally, and often under images and parables which detract much from their clearness.

Hermas gives us twice a connected description of the disorders he intends to censure: in Similitude 8^{6-10}, and then in Similitude 9^{19-31}. At the time he is writing his book, persecution has already raged, and side by side with martyrs who have valiantly confessed their faith, may be found apostates who, not only have denied it, but also have blasphemed and denounced their brethren. Others have apostatized, merely through self-interest, because of too great an attachment to their temporal goods. Then there are teachers of lies, hypocrites who spread error; rich and mighty ones, who, without renouncing their belief, lead, in the midst of pagans, a wholly pagan life; Christians who are slanderers and blunderheads and always ready to form cliques; ambitious men, who are self-conceited and rash; sinners who yield to their passions; in short, a whole series of spiritual weaknesses, that were to be found not only in the ordinary Christians, but also in the leaders of the community (*Simil.* 9, 26^2; *Vis.*, 2, 2^6). All these evils can be accounted for, according to Hermas, by the *διψυχία*, viz., by the hesitation and division of the soul between two beliefs and two lines of conduct: though the author does not always attach the same meaning to this word which often comes to his pen, yet *διψυχία* always implies, after all, a lack of strong convictions.

---

[1] TH. ZAHN, *Der Hirt des Hermas untersucht*, Gotha, 1868; AD. LINK, *Christi Person und Werk im Hirten des Hermas*, Marburg, 1886; A. RIBAGNAC, *La Christologie du Pasteur d'Hermas*, Paris, 1887; E. HÜCKSTADT, *Der Lehrbegriff des Hirten*, Anklam, 1887; A. STAHL, *Patristische Untersuchungen*, Leipsic, 1901; P. BATIFFOL, *Etudes d'Histoire et de Théologie Positive*, 1st series, Paris, 1904, pp. 45, ff.; D. VÖLTER, *Die apostolischen Väter neu untersucht*, I, Leyden, 1904.

Sinners, nay, apostates, are, then, to be found in the Church. Can they do penance and is there for them a pardon? Hermas has heard certain doctors say that there is none, and that the only penance granted to a Christian is the one he performs in Baptism when he receives the remission of his former sins (*Command* 4, 3[1]): this error which was to be upheld later on by some Montanists, was already followed by a few (*παρά τινων διδασκάλων*). On the contrary, other false teachers, imbued with Gnostic ideas, whom Hermas accuses of importing foreign doctrines, persuaded the sinners that they did not need any penance (*Simil.* 8, 6[5]). These two extreme opinions Hermas does not accept. On one hand, he declares penance necessary: it alone can save the sinner (*Vis.* 3, 7[2, 6]; *Simil.* 8, 8[4, 5], 9[4], 11[3]); on the other hand, he declares it possible and efficacious (*Simil.* 8, 6[3], 11[3]): let us examine more closely on what conditions.

First of all, our author admits of penance only for sins committed until the moment when he writes. After that, the offending Christians cannot reckon on that means of reconciliation. To the Gentiles alone, penance (through Baptism) is possible until the end of time (*Vis.* 2, 2[5, 8]). The penance he preaches, then, presents the character of an extraordinary concession: it is a kind of jubilee.

In the second place, he grants that penance but once to the Christians of his time (*Command* 4, 3[4-6]): we cannot alternately, as it were, often sin, and then repent: should we act thus, we should make our salvation extremely improbable.

But that penance, that unique forgiveness, does Hermas grant it at least to all categories of sinners? At first sight, we might think that he excludes the apostates who have blasphemed and who have denounced their brethren: he declares they are a wicked race, that has died to God for ever (εἰς τέλος, *Simil.* 8, 6^{4}; *Simil.* 9, 19^{1}; cf. *Simil.* 6, $2^{3,4}$). These words, however, are the expression of an experience ascertained, rather than that of a principle. The rods that represent the apostates that have blasphemed have been, just as the other rods, planted and watered by the Shepherd, and he who has made them intended that they should, like the others, become green again (*Simil.* 8, $2^{8,9}$). Hence it is only because of their obduracy that these unfortunate sinners have remained in death. In regard to the other categories of sinners, Hermas not only admits that they can be reconciled, he even thinks that, as a matter of fact, most of them do get their pardon (*Simil.* 8, 6^{6}, 8^{2}, $9^{1,2}$; $10^{1,3}$). The δίψυχοι Christians are easily converted, and the loss of any one of them seems rather difficult (δυσκόλως; cf. *Simil.* 8, 10^{2}).

How is that penance to be done in practice? The author does not enlarge much on this point. As is evident, we ought first to repent of our sins and change our interior dispositions: penance is a μετάνοια (*Simil.* 7, 4); still, this does not suffice: the true convert must also bear the punishments his sins have deserved, and crucify his soul and body (*ibid.*). A determined rate is mentioned: one hour of forbidden pleasure is expiated by thirty days of penance, and one day (viz., twelve hours), by one year (*Simil.* 6,^{4}).

Side by side with this penitential doctrine, we find in the *Shepherd* a system of moral teachings, generally stamped with indulgent moderation and great common sense. We may note down a few features thereof. Fasting is reckoned among the works of penance (*Vis.* 3, 1^{1}); yet, let it be well understood: God is far more pleased by aversion to the world than by mere material fasting (*Simil.* 5, 1): the latter, moreover, must be turned into alms (*Simil.* 5, 3^{7}). — Hermas presents, without any hesitation, the fulfilment of the commandments, as the condition necessary for obtaining life and the object of God's promises (*Simil.* 1, 7, 6, 1^{1}, 10, 2^{4}, etc.): the preaching of Jesus is a *law* (νόμος, *Simil.* 8, $3^{2,3}$).—In connection with chastity, the author treats the case of adultery. The husband who is aware of his wife's infidelity must not dwell with her; otherwise he shares in her sin; but neither ought he to take another wife, else he too would become an adulterer. If the woman repents, he *must* take her back. The same must be said of the wife in regard to the husband (*Command* 4, 1^{4-10}). Hermas, then, does not authorize a divorce attempted because of adultery. However, from his text, it does not appear very clearly whether he gives such a decision because he considers marriage as absolutely indissoluble, or rather because he places on the offended party the obligation of making it possible for the guilty one to do penance and repent. As to a second marriage, Hermas allows it, though he thinks widowhood is preferable (*Command* 4, $4^{1,2}$). Among all virtues — and he recommends many of them — the one he places first is innocence, simplicity, purity of life. They who practise it are typified by a green and fruitful mountain (*Simil.* 9, 24), or also by a mountain wholly white (*Simil.* 9, 29^{1-3}), and the author does not hesitate to prefer them even to martyrs (cf. *Simil.* 9, 28). One of the forms of that innocence is continence, chastity. Hermas not only recommends not to defile the body in which the Holy Ghost dwells, but is himself an *encratite* (Ἑρμᾶς ὁ ἐγκρατής, *Vis.* 1, 2^{4}): henceforth he will live with his wife as with a sister (*Vis.* 2, 2^{3}, 3^{1}); he has sinned, but his perfect continence shall save him (πολλὴ ἐγκράτεια, *Vis.* 2, 3^{2}).

Dogmatic teaching, strictly so called, holds in the *Shepherd* a far smaller place than the moral teaching, and is treated in it only incidentally, as I have already said. A passage, often quoted, on the unity of God and on creation (*Command* 1, 1), has contributed to make this little work well known. Among

God's attributes, Hermas insists chiefly on His mercy. Though he does not call Him Father, still he evidently regards Him as such.

As to the Christology of the *Shepherd*, it has given rise to many discussions and controversies which, perhaps, cannot be fully solved.

We may remark first that Hermas never uses the terms *Word* and *Jesus Christ* to designate the Saviour: he always designates Him by the title of Son of God (*υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*) or also of Lord (*κύριος*, *Vis.* 3, 7^3). This Lord is made up, during His mortal life, of two elements, a humanity or a flesh (*σάρξ*) and a holy Spirit that dwells therein (*Simil.* 5, $6^{5, 6}$). Hence the question that comes up is this: does not Hermas confound with the Holy Ghost the divine element joined to the flesh of Jesus? Does he truly distinguish, before the Incarnation, besides the Father and the Holy Ghost, another divine person who became incarnate, or is this incarnate divine person the Holy Ghost Himself? And, since he admits, as we shall see later on, that in its reward the humanity of Jesus has been associated with the Father and the Spirit, is not, in his system, the trinity of persons consequent on the glorification of Jesus, instead of preceding it, as in the doctrine of the Church?

The texts that have given rise to this difficulty are found in the fifth Similitude, chapters 2, 5 and 6, with which we must connect the ninth Similitude, 1^1, $12^{1, 3}$. Now, notwithstanding the obscurities that still remain, we can infer from these passages; (1) that Hermas establishes between God and the Holy Ghost the relations of Father to Son: "The Son [of the Master] is the Holy Spirit (*ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιόν ἐστιν*, *Simil.* 5, 5^2); — (2) that in his system, the Holy Ghost has assumed a body, or rather has been made by God to dwell in a body (*κατῴκισεν ὁ θεὸς εἰς σάρκα*, *Simil.* 5, 6^5), in order that with it He might constitute the Saviour; — (3) that, consequently, Jesus is, for Hermas, a mere man in whom the Holy Ghost has dwelt, the author of the *Shepherd* being, on this point, the precursor of the Adoptianists, and ascribing to the text of St. Luke $3^{21, 22}$, about the descent of the Holy Ghost on Jesus, a bearing it has not; — (4) that, finally, the trinity of persons in God is always for him a result of glorification of that flesh which has entered into participation with the Holy Spirit and God's inheritance (*Simil.* 5, 6^{6}); for it is not certain, moreover, that Hermas admits the perseverance of the union of the Spirit and the flesh, after the Saviour's glorification, that flesh being, so to speak, given back to itself, once its office has been accomplished (*Simil.* 5, 6^{7}).

Of the redeeming work of the Son of God, the *Shepherd* says very little: he mentions only the sufferings and labors the Saviour bore for that purpose, and the cleansing of the sins of the people He has thus wrought (*Simil.* 5, $6^{2, 3}$). In regard to the Holy Ghost, Hermas being a prophet and a seer has no doubt about His divinity. The Holy Spirit is the Son of the Father (*Simil.* 5, 5^{2}, $6^{4, 7}$; 9, 1^{1}); He is anterior to any creature (*τὸ προόν*, *Simil.* 5, 6^{5}; *πάσης τῆς κτίσεως προγενέστερος*, *Simil.* 9, 12^{2}), Himself Author of creation and, at the same time, adviser of the Father in this act (*Simil.* 5, 6^{5}; 9, 12^{2}). He dwelt in Jesus: He dwells likewise in the faithful (*Simil.* 5, 6^{7}). The author comes back often to this idea.

With the doctrine on the Holy Ghost angelology is connected. That of Hermas is rather abundant, but it is not precise, and some scholars have asked themselves if it should not be more severely characterized. Hermas distinguishes first six principal Angels who build the mystical tower (*Vis.* 3, 4^{1}; *Simil.* 9, $12^{7, 8}$; cf. $3^{1, 4}$, 4^{4}, etc.). In their midst there is a man who rules over them and whose servants they are: he is the Son of God (*Simil.* 9, $12^{7, 8}$). On the other hand, several times, mention is made of a most venerable and glorious Angel, who seems to preside over others. In *Command* 5, 1^{7}, he is said to justify (*ἐδικαιώθησαν*) those who do penance, and we find him again in *Simil.* 5, 4^{4}; 7, 1–5; 9, 1^{3}. Finally the eighth Similitude tells us again of a glorious and most high Angel, who gives to the people the rods detached from the mysterious willow, and whose name is Michael (1^{2}, 3^{3}). He inserts the law into the hearts of believers, and visits them to see if they keep it. Now, it seems that to these three personages: — the Son of God, the most venerable and glorious Angel, the Angel Michael, — the same functions are ascribed (*Simil.* 8, 2^{5}, 3^{5}; 9, $7^{1,2}$; 8, 3^{3}; 9, $5^{2,6,7}$, 6^{3-6}, 10^{4}). Hence, are they to be identified, and must we believe that, in those passages, Hermas has confounded the Angel Michael with the Son of God, viz., the Holy Ghost? To affirm it is rather difficult, because the language in which the author expresses his thoughts lacks precision. That he has confounded the Holy Ghost with the first Angel, the most venerable Angel, seems not improbable; that he has confounded Him with Michael, is more doubtful; he seems rather to oppose one to the other in the eighth Similitude, $3^{2,3}$.

Hermas speaks often of the Church. She it is, who has shown herself to him in his first visions, under the features of a matron (*Vis.* 2, 4^{1}; 3, 11, 12, 13), and whom he depicts under the figure of a mystical tower (*Vis.* 3, 3^{3}; *Simil.* 8, 13^{1}); but in this latter case, the author designates, not the Church militant, the *corpus mixtum* made up of the just and of the wicked, but the Church of the predestined and of the just. The Church, he tells us, has been the first of all creatures (*πάντων πρώτη ἐκτίσθη*); for her the world has been made (*Vis.* 2, 4^{1}; cf. *Vis.* 1, 1^{6}); she is built on the Son of God, as on a rock, and belongs to Him as to a master (*Simil.* 9, $12^{1,7,8}$).

Then, in the Church upon earth, Hermas distinguishes the *προηγουμένοι* (*Vis.* 2, 2^{6}), viz., presbyters who preside, with whom he must read his book (*Vis.* 2, 4^{3}), and who sit down the first (*Vis.* 3, 1^{8}). A little further, *οἱ ἀπόστολοι, καὶ ἐπίσκοποι,* *καὶ διδάσκαλοι καὶ διάκονοι* are mentioned, some of whom are already dead, others still living (*Vis.* 3, 5^{1}); then, after, *ἡγουμένοι* and *πρωτοκαθεδρίται*, whose office consists in teaching and training (*παιδεύειν*) the elect (*Vis.* 3, $9^{7, 10}$). Deacons and overseers are again mentioned in the ninth Similitude, 26^{2}, 27^{2}. These various functions, some of which resemble one another, refer us to the organization we shall find, though more precise, in the Didache. Hermas does not state the relation he establishes between the overseers and the presbyters, though we must notice the mention he makes of a certain Clement to whom he must deliver a copy of his book and who will send it to the other cities (*εἰς τὰς ἔξω πόλεις*), and thus fulfil his function (*ἐκείνῳ γὰρ ἐπιτέτραπται*, *Vis.* 2, 4^{3}). Is this Clement the illustrious bishop of Rome, from whose reputation the author wished to derive some profit? Perhaps so, but we are not sure of it. The Grapte to whom Hermas must also give his book, and who teaches the widows and orphans (*Vis.* 2, 4^{3}), is probably a deaconess.

It is only through Baptism that we can enter into the Church and be saved (*Vis.* 3, 3^{5}; *Simil.* 9, $16^{1-4, 7}$). The necessity of Baptism is such that the Apostles and teachers (*διδάσκαλοι*) who preached the Gospel had to go down to limbo, there to teach and baptize the just already dead (*Simil.* 9, 16^{5-7}). Baptism seems to be given *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου* (*Vis.* 3, 7^{3}). Its effect is to make us die to our former life, that we may live another life: he who receives baptism descends into the water in a state of death and comes out of it in a state of life (*Simil.* 9, 16^{3-7}). Baptism is a seal, *σφραγίς*, the seal of the Son of God (*Simil.* 9, $16^{3, 4}$); that seal is broken by sin, but can be repaired by penance (*Simil.* 8, 6^{3}).

As to the eschatological views of Hermas, they are rather brief, for he is far more busy about correcting the present than describing the future. Here below, the just and the wicked are alike (*Simil.* 3), but, later on, in the future age, the discrimination will take place (*Simil.* 4, 1–3). That future age is to be preceded by great tribulations, probably by persecutions (*Vis.* 4, 3^6, 2^5), but soon it will come (*Vis.* 3, 8^9). The destiny of the wicked will be terrible: the impenitent, sinners and pagans shall be cast into the fire (*Vis.* 3, 7^2; *Simil.* 4, 4): those who have yielded to wicked desires shall die *εἰς τέλος* (*Command* 12, 2, 3). Whoever, not knowing God, has done evil, shall be judged *εἰς θάνατον*: but whoever, knowing Him, has done evil, shall be doubly punished and die forever (*ἀποθανοῦνται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, *Simil.* 9, 18^2). However, this will not be the destiny of most men: Hermas thinks that the majority of the Christians whom he knows shall be saved (*Simil.* 8, 1^{16}). The just receive crowns (*Simil.* 8, 2), are with the Angels and enjoy everlasting life (*Vis.* 2, 2^7, 3^3; 4, 3^5). The society of the Angels is reserved more particularly for the apostles, the teachers of truth, the overseers and hospitalers who help the poor, the widows and the servants of God (*Simil.* 9, 15^2, 27^3).

§ 4. — The Second Epistle of St. Clement.[1]

The very ancient homily known under the name of the second Epistle of St. Clement offers with the *Shepherd* of Hermas such analogies of preoccupations and ideas, that we can most reasonably refer both to the same time, if not to the same surroundings. As the author is concerned chiefly about exhorting the faithful to practise good works and to do penance, as a preparation for the judgment to come, the dogmatic material of the Epistle is rather scanty.

At the very beginning, however, we find a categorical affirmation of the divinity of Jesus: "Brethren, we ought so to think of Jesus Christ as of God — as of the Judge of the living and the dead" (1^1)[1]. The words of Jesus in St. Luke, $6^{32, 35}$ are quoted with the formula λέγει ὁ θεός, in chapter 13^4. In chapter 9^5, we are told that Christ was first spirit, then became flesh and thus called us (ὢν μὲν τὸ πρῶτον πνεῦμα εγένετο σάρξ). In this flesh, He has much suffered for us (1^2); He is our Saviour, the author of incorruptibleness, through whom the heavenly truth and life have appeared to us (20^5; cf. 1^7).

---

[1] Hagemann, *Ueber den zweiten Brief des Klemens von Rom*, in the *Theolog. Quartalschrift*, vol. XLIII, 1861; A. Harnack, *Ueber den sogn. zweiten Brief des Klemens an die Korinther*, in the *Zeitschr. für Kirchengeschichte*, vol. I, 1876–1877; H. Hemmer, *Clément de Rome*, Paris, 1909, in the series *Textes et Documents*.

With Jesus, our homily closely associates the Church. In a passage peculiar (14^{1-5}) and difficult to interpret — perhaps, because the text is corrupt — the author sets forth what follows. The Church is prior to the creation of the sun and the moon: she was first spiritual and invisible: now, she has become visible: she is the flesh, the spouse of Christ — for the spouse is the flesh of the husband (*Ephes.*, $5^{28, 29}$); she is also His copy, for the flesh is the copy of the spirit, and Jesus is spiritual (πνευματικός). This being the case, the Church becomes, in some way, one with our own flesh, so that, when we defile our flesh, we defile also the Church, and lose at the same time the possibility of sharing in the Spirit that is Christ. — It must be confessed that this reasoning — which I have tried to unravel — is quite complicated and seems to betray the tendency of the Gnostic school of Valentinus to represent Christ and the Church as heavenly eons, and their relations as relations of sex. Perhaps, however, this teaching ought to be taken as nothing but a too literal interpretation of the passages of the Epistle to the Ephesians, 1^4, $1^{22, 23}$, $5^{23, 33}$. The author seems, as Hermas did, to confound Christ with the Holy Ghost: still, this point is too uncertain to be insisted upon.

Baptism is a seal (σφραγίς, 7^6, 8^6), which we must preserve pure and untainted, if we wish to obtain life and escape the pains of hell (6^9, 7^6). We keep it, by fulfilling God's commandments. The document we are now studying is most clear and earnest on the necessity of good works and their efficacy for salvation ($1^{3,5}$, $3^{3,4}$, 4^3, $5^{1,6}$, $6^{7,9}$, 8^4, $11^{6,7}$, 17^4, 19^3): they are the compensation (*ἀντιμισθία*) we make to Jesus for what He has done for us (1^3); moreover, the document in question admits a penance for the sins that are committed ($8^{1,2}$) and to which *διψυχία* prompts us (11^5, 19^2). This penance, likewise, is a compensation (*ἀντιμισθία*) for what we owe to God ($9^{7,8}$). The author says nothing of its external conditions: however, he points out almsgiving as the chief work of penance and the principal means by which sin is remitted (*κούφισμα ἁμαρτίας*): it is preferable to fasting, which itself is better than prayer (16^4).

---

[1] Ἀδελφοί οὕτως δεῖ ἡμᾶς φρονεῖν περὶ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ ὡς περὶ θεοῦ, ὡς περὶ κριτοῦ ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν.

As to the separation of the just from the wicked, it will take place on the day of judgment (17^{4-7}, 18^2). The body shall rise and be judged (11^{1-4}); the disobedient, condemned to everlasting punishments (6^7, 7^6, 15^5, 17^5). Those, who, in their words or conduct, have denied Jesus, shall be cast into the horrible torments of a fire that cannot be extinguished (17^7). On the contrary, the just shall be happy: they shall enjoy the repose of the kingdom and of eternal life (5^5): their blessedness shall be unmixed and everlasting (19^4), the crown of their sufferings and labors ($7^{2,3}$, 20^2), and the reward (*τὸν μισθόν*) of their firmness in well-doing (11^5).

§ 5. — The Epistles of St. Ignatius.[1]

Of all the Apostolic Fathers, St. Ignatius is most certainly the one whose thoughts are the deepest. His teaching is not a mere echo of what was believed around him, but betrays personal reflection and a conviction in some way reasoned out. On the other hand, we should not expect to find in his letters a complete theological system; they are writings composed only for the occasion, whose content is determined by the state of the Churches he is addressing, by his own state and also by the character of the erroneous doctrines he is opposing.

---

[1] Th. Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochien*, Gotha, 1873; Th. Dreher, *S. Ignatii episcopi Antiocheni de Christo Deo doctrina*, Sigmaringen, 1877; A. Brüll, *Der Episkopat und die Ignatianischen Briefe*, in the *Theol. Quartalschr.*, vol. LXI, 1879; J. Virschl, *Die Theologie des hl. Ignatius*, Mentz, 1880; J. Réville, *Étude sur les Origines de l'Episcopat*, Paris, 1891; Von der Goltz, *Ignatius*

Later on we shall see what these doctrines were; for the time being, we may remark that this ἑτεροδοξία, as he terms it (*Magn.*, 8^{1}), presented a threefold character: — it fomented schisms and parties outside the bishop; it extolled Jewish practices and observances; it taught Docetism; perhaps too, it preached immorality, more or less openly.

The teaching St. Ignatius opposes thereto bears chiefly on the three following points: Christ, the Church, Christian life. Christ incarnate: such is the centre of his theology; Christ living in the Church and in each one of us, such is its development.

The unity of God is for Ignatius a primordial truth: "There is one God, who has manifested Himself by Jesus Christ His Son" (*Magn.*, 8^{2}): nevertheless, he proclaims Jesus as God; he knows and mentions the three divine terms (*Eph.*, 9^{1}; *Magn.*, 13^{1}).

The Bishop of Antioch does not altogether pass by the doctrine of the Logos. Jesus, he says, is the Logos of God, come

---

von Antiochien als Christ und Theologe, Leipsic, 1894; E. Bruston, *Ignace d'Antioche, ses épîtres, sa vie, sa théologie*, Paris, 1897; A. Stahl, *Patristische Untersuchungen*, Leipsic, 1901; A. Lelong, *d'Ignace Antioche*, Paris, 1910, in the series *Textes et Documents.* — Specially on the Epistle to the Romans: A. Harnack, *Die Zeugnis des Ignatius über das Anschen des römischen Gemeinde*, in the *Sitzungsber. der K. preuss. Akad. der Vissensch. zu Berlin*, 1896; J. Chapman, *S. Ignace d'Antioche et l'Eglise romaine*, in the *Revue bênéd.*, vol. XIII, 1896; F. X. Funk, *Der Primat der römischen Kirche nach Ignatius und Irenaeus*, in his *Kirchengeschichtl. Abhandl. und Untersuch.*, vol. I, Paderborn, 1897; Batiffol, *L'Eglise Naissante et le Catholicisme*, Paris, 1909, p. 167, foll.

forth from silence to manifest the Father (λόγος ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθών, *Magn.*, 8^2). Here the question is not about the generation of the Son, but about His mission *ad extra*. This Word, or rather Jesus Christ — for this last appellation is the one constantly used — "was before all ages with the Father" (*Magn.*, 6^1). St. Ignatius often and unhesitatingly affirms His divinity: Jesus Christ is God (θεὸς Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, *Trall.*, 7^1), the God (τὸν θεόν) who renders the faithful wise (*Smyrn.*, 1^1): He is our God (ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, *Ephes.*, Inscript., 15^3, 18^2; *Rom.*, Inscript., 3^3; *Polyc.*, 8^3), the God of Ignatius (τοῦ θεοῦ μου, *Rom.*, 6^3); His blood is the blood of God (ἐν αἵματι θεοῦ *Eph.*, 1^1); He raised Himself up of His own power from the dead (*Smyrn.*, 2^1).[1]

What is far less apparent in our Epistles — supposing that it can be found at all — is the mention of the divine and eternal sonship of the Word, independently of the Incarnation. The holy Martyr seems rather to ascribe the divine sonship of Jesus to the fact that Mary conceived by the operation of the Holy Ghost. Thus, by opposition to His birth from the Virgin, Jesus is called ἀγέννητος (*Eph.*, 7^2). A descendant of David according to the flesh, He is "Son of God according to the will and power of God, truly born of a virgin" (*Smyrn.*, 1^1); again: "Of the race of David according to the flesh, He is the Son of man and Son of God" (*Eph.*, 20^2).

This generation of Jesus Christ according to the flesh constitutes the οἰκονομία (*Eph.*, 18^2), the human manifestation of God (θεοῦ ἀνθρωπίνως φανερωμένου, *Eph.*, 19^{31}). Ignatius discards absolutely the conceptions that would deny the Davidic descent of Jesus, or His being a man as we are, of our race (*Rom.*, 7^3; *Eph.*, 19^3, 20^2; *Smyrn.*, 1^1): he affirms Mary's true and absolute maternity: Jesus is *ἐκ Μαρίας καὶ ἐκ θεοῦ* (*Eph.*, 7^2), *γεγενημένον ἀληθῶς ἐκ παρθένου* (*Smyrn.*, 1^1); but he maintains just as strongly at the same time the mother's virginity in His conception (*Eph.*, 7^2, 18^2: *Smyrn.*, 1^1). The virginity and childbirth of Mary, and the death of Jesus have been concealed from the prince of this world: they constitute the three mysteries of preaching, that have been prepared in the silence of God (*Eph.*, 19^1).

---

[1] We may place side by side with these texts of St. Ignatius the admission made by Christians, which is reported by Pliny the Younger in his letter to Trajan (*Epist.*, X, 97), written about 112–113, that they used to gather on an appointed day and sing a hymn to Christ *as to a God* "*carmenque Christo quasi Deo dicere secum invicem.*"

As we may easily imagine, if the Bishop of Antioch rejects anything ever so little incompatible with the real birth of Jesus *ex Maria*, he opposes with still greater energy, if possible, the Docetism of the false teachers who transform into a mere appearance the Saviour's humanity. Jesus Christ, he says, is "truly (ἀληθῶς) come from the race of David according to the flesh . . . truly born of a virgin . . . He was truly nailed for us in His flesh under Pontius Pilate and Herod the tetrarch" (*Smyrn.*, $1^{1,2}$). "He suffered truly, as He also truly raised Himself up and not, as some unbelievers say (pretending) that He only seemed to suffer (τὸ δοκεῖν), they themselves only seeming to be" (*Smyrn.*, 2). And then, Jesus did not lay aside that flesh after His resurrection: "I know," Ignatius declares, "that even after His resurrection, He was in the flesh, and I believe that He is [still] so. And when He came to those who were with Peter, He said unto them: Take, handle me, and see that I am not an incorporeal genius. And straightway they felt Him and believed, having been in contact both with His flesh and spirit. . . . And after His resurrection, He did eat and drink with them, as He was flesh; although as to His spirit He was united to the Father" (*Smyrn.*, 3).

St. Ignatius marks very clearly then, both the divinity and the humanity of the Saviour; and hence he gives Him at the same time and by opposition human and divine attributes. In this regard, chiefly two passages have drawn the attention of scholars.

The first is in the Epistle to the Ephesians, 7^2: "There is one physician, both corporeal and spiritual, begotten and unbegotten, become God in the flesh, true life in death, [born] both of Mary and of God, first passible, then impassible, Jesus Christ our Lord." [1]

The second is in the Epistle to Polycarp, 3^2: "Expect Him, who is above all time, the eternal, the invisible, for our sakes visible, the impalpable, the impassible, for our sakes passible, who has suffered in all manner of ways for our sakes." [2]

Some scholars (Harnack, Bruston) have sought to invalidate the witness of these texts in behalf of the divinity of Jesus, by referring the contrary attributes therein mentioned, not to a twofold element, divine and human, existing *simultaneously* in Jesus, but to a twofold *successive* state of the Saviour. According to Ignatius, Jesus, at first a mere man, would have become God, and thus acquired in His glorification the divine attributes. But the reasons brought forward for such an interpretation are not conclusive, nor even always admissible. If we remember that St. Ignatius most firmly maintains the preexistence of Jesus, and His divinity while upon earth, we cannot doubt the general meaning of these texts: in them the Bishop of Antioch ascribes to the Saviour simultaneously the qualities becoming a man, and those becoming a God.

According to the holy Martyr, the work of this Saviour is reduced chiefly to two objects: to bring us the knowledge of God, and to destroy death by bringing us life. Jesus Christ, who is the thought, the sentence of the Father (*τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ γνώμη*), the truthful mouth by which He expresses Himself (*Eph.*, 3^2;

---

[1] Εἷς *ἰατρός ἐστιν, σαρκικός τε καὶ πνευματικός, γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος, ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος θεός, ἐν θανάτῳ ζωὴ ἀληθινή, καὶ ἐκ* Μαρίας *καὶ ἐκ θεοῦ, πρῶτον παθητὸς καὶ τότε ἀπαθής,* Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς *ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν.*

[2] Τὸν *ὑπὲρ καιρὸν προσδόκα, τὸν ἄχρονον, τὸν ἀόρατον, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς ὁρατόν, τὸν ἀψηλάφητον, τὸν ἀπαθῆ, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς παθητόν, τὸν κατὰ πάντα τρόπον δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπομείναντα.*

Rom., 8[2]), has become for us the knowledge of God and our only teacher (τοῦ θεοῦ γνῶσις, *Eph.*, 17[2], 15[1]; *Magn.*, 9[1]). Moreover, in manifesting Himself in a human guise, Jesus intended to do away with death (θανάτου κατάλυσις) and replace it by the newness of eternal life (εἰς καινότητα ἀϊδίου ζωῆς, *Eph.*, 19[3]). This life consists for us in the spirit of the Cross (πνεῦμα τοῦ σταυροῦ, *Eph.*, 18[1]): it comes to us from the death of Jesus Christ, as the fruit of His blood that was shed, of the blood of God (*Eph.*, 1[1]; *Magn.*, 9[1]). The author does not say anything more as to the way in which he understands redemption; though, in the Epistle to the Philadelphians, 9[1], he sets before us Jesus as the ἀρχιερεύς, to whom alone the mysteries of God and the Holy of Holies have been entrusted, as "the Door of the Father, by which Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the Prophets enter in, as well as the Apostles and the Church." Through Him the whole world comes to the Father, so that in definitive, "Christianity did not believe in Judaism, but Judaism did believe in Christianity, in which are gathered all those who believe in God" (*Magn.*, 10[3]).

Every Church is the house of the Heavenly Father, His family (*Eph.*, 6[1]). Christ's head was anointed with perfumes (*Matt.*, 26[7]), in order that He might communicate incorruptibility to the Church (ἀφθαρσία, *Eph.*, 17[1]): the context shows that reference is made to doctrinal incorruptibility. St. Ignatius is the first author who applies to the Church the title of καθολική: "Wheresoever the bishop shall appear, there let the people also be; as where Jesus Christ is, there is the catholic Church" (*Smyrn.*, 8[2]). However, some have thought that, by this expression, St. Ignatius meant simply the collection of all the particular Churches bound together by relations of mutual help and charity. Anyhow, our author thinks certainly, that the Church must be universal, catholic, viz., embrace all mankind, for Christ, he says, "has set up, through His resurrection, in all ages, the standard for the saints and for His followers, whether they be Jews or Gentiles, in the one body of His Church" (*Smyrn.*, 1[2]).

But what Ignatius is anxious to find in every Christian congregation, is chiefly unity. He knows the dangers to which the churches of Asia Minor are exposed because of coteries and heresies: hence he adjures them to gather around the Bishop, the *presbyterium* and the deacons, as the centre of that unity. He is the first author in whom we find set forth, quite clearly, the monarchical episcopate, viz., the supremacy of the bishop, and in each Church, the supremacy of one bishop over the body of priests (the *presbyterium*) and the deacons.

Very often (cf. above all, *Philad.*, 4), he regards these three orders as forming, in regard to the faithful, a whole, the ruling members of the Church, whom they should obey; though, now and then, he sets apart sometimes the first two orders (*Eph.*, 2[2], 20[2]; *Magn.*, 2, 7[1]; *Trall.*, 13[2]), sometimes too the first order alone, as representing in the Church the authority to which all, even priests, ought to submit: "It becomes you to go according to the will of the bishop, as also ye do; for your famous *presbyterium*, worthy of God, is attached to the bishop as the chords to the lyre" (*Eph.*, 4[1]). "It does not become you to use your bishop too familiarly upon the account of his youth; but rather, in consideration of the power of God the Father, to pay him all reverence, as I heard that the holy priests do; for they do not take advantage of his youth in this high position; but, being prudent in God, they submit to him, or rather not to him, but to the Father of Jesus Christ, to the bishop of all" (*Magn.*, 3[1]; cf. *Trall.*, 12[2]). The bishop is the centre of the Church: where he is, there also the community must be, just as where Jesus Christ is, there is the Church (*Smyrn.*, 8[2]; cf. *Smyrn.*, 11[1]; *Polyc.*, 4[1]). In this hierarchical trinity: — bishop, presbyterium, deacons, the bishop takes the place of God the Father, priests represent the Apostolic College, deacons, Jesus Christ (*Magn.*, 6[1]; *Trall.*, 3[1]; *Smyrn.*, 8[1]), —

an arrangement which first may surprise us, but which may be accounted for, if we remark that the author considers Jesus as the Father's minister (*διάκονος*), and deacons as exercising the *διακονία* Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (*Magn.*, 6^1). Besides, St. Ignatius states most clearly the inferiority of deacons in regard to priests (*Magn.*, 2): they are always mentioned in the third place.

What are the duties of the faithful towards these guides of the Church? Primarily and essentially, there is only one obligation: to remain united with them in sentiments, faith and obedience. Ignatius does not allow that in any case Christians can part from the authority in their views or conduct: they must be subject to the bishop, the presbyterium, the deacons (*Eph.*, 2^2, 5^3, 20^2; *Magn.*, 2, 3^1, $6^{1,2}$, 13^2; *Trall.*, $2^{1,2}$, 13^2; *Philad.*, 7^1; *Smyrn.*, 8^1; *Polyc.*, 6^1): nothing must be done in the Church without them (*Trall.*, 2^2, 7^2; *Philad.*, 7^2: *Smyrn.*, 8^1; *Polyc.*, 4^1). More particularly, Jesus Christ being the sentence of the Father, and bishops who live upon earth being in the doctrine of Jesus Christ (*ἐν* Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ *γνώμῃ*), it is proper to share the bishop's doctrine (*Eph.*, 3^2, 4^1). By remaining united with Jesus and the bishop, and by following the Apostolic commands, we shall feed on Christian food and abstain from that foreign plant, that is heresy (*Trall.*, 6^1; 7^1). Then, those who are of God and of Jesus Christ are with the bishop: schismatics shall not inherit the kingdom of heaven (*Philad.*, $3^{2,3}$). Moreover, the bishop is not only the doctrinal and disciplinary centre of the Church, but also the liturgical centre thereof: "Let that Eucharist be looked upon as legitimate (*βεβαία*) which is offered by the bishop or by him to whom he has given his consent . . . It is not lawful, without the bishop, either to baptize or to celebrate the agape (or the Eucharist): whatsoever he approves of, that is also pleasing unto God; that so whatever is done may be firm and valid" (*Smyrn.*, $8^{1,2}$; cf. *Polyc.*, 5^2).

Now, among those Churches thus conceived and organized, does Ignatius distinguish one of a superior authority? The affirmative seems to result from the inscription of his Epistle to the Romans — in which, though, he does not mention the bishop. — Not only he multiplies, in behalf of the Church of Rome, the terms of praise, but he designates her as presiding in the place of the country of the Romans (*ἥτις καὶ προκάθηται ἐν τόπῳ χωρίου Ῥωμαίων*), as worthily chaste and presiding over charity (*ἀξιόαγνος καὶ προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης*).

What is the bearing of these expressions? We may remark first that, in the first text, the words *ἐν τόπῳ κτλ.*, do not mean the *limits* of the presidency of the Roman Church, but the *place* where it is established and exercised: *προκάθηται* is in the absolute mode: at this time there is no question of the Roman patriarchate or of suffragan Churches: the Church of Rome presides, and the seat of this presidency is the city of Rome, *ἐν τόπῳ χωρίου Ῥωμαίων.* On the other hand, the expression *ἀγάπη*, of the second passage, might very well designate the Christian brotherhood in general, the Christians themselves. The word is taken in a concrete sense four times at least in St. Ignatius (*Trall.*, 13^1; *Rom.*, 9^3; *Philad.*, 11^2; *Smyrn.*, 12^1), and most probably, too, in *Rom.*, 9^1. We would have then here a testimony in behalf of the Roman primacy; though, on the other hand, Ignatius does not state whether he ascribes it to the political importance of the city of Rome, or to the person of the founder of her Church.

Among the Sacraments, the Bishop of Antioch notes first Baptism, which he merely mentions (*Polyc.*, 2^2; *Smyrn.*, 8^2; cf. *Eph.*, 18^2). On the Eucharist, he is more explicit. We may observe that he uses already the word *εὐχαριστία* to designate the consecrated elements themselves (*Smyrn.*, 7^1). But "from the Eucharist and prayer [heretics] abstain, because they do not confess that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which has suffered for our sins and which the Father has raised up from the dead in His kindness" (*διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν κτλ., ibid.*). Writing to the Ephesians (20^{2}), he recommends to them union with the bishop and the presbyterium, "breaking one and the same bread, which is the medicine of immortality, the antidote that we should not die, but live forever in Christ Jesus." The first of these texts implies in St. Ignatius a realistic view of the presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist. Still, that we may not exaggerate its bearing, we should remember that the heretics to whom the author was alluding were docetæ, and held apart their meetings (cf. 8^{1}). Then, addressing the Romans (7^{3}), though he does not speak directly to the eucharistic body and blood of Jesus, the holy Bishop evidently borrows from this mystery his expressions and images: "I take no delight in the food of corruption, nor in the pleasures of this life: I desire the bread of God which is the flesh of Jesus Christ [born] of the seed of David: and the drink that I long for is His blood which is incorruptible charity." [1]

The Eucharist is the symbol and bond of union among Christians: "Let it be your endeavor to partake all of one Eucharist, for there is but one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one chalice in the unity of His blood, one altar, as also there is one bishop with the presbyterium and the deacons" (*Philad.*, 4). Elsewhere he speaks also of those who are within or outside the altar, viz., of those who are pure or impure, in connection with the submission to the bishop, priests and deacons (*Trall.*, 7^{2}).

Marriage itself is placed under the bishop's supervision: it must be contracted with his agreement (*μετὰ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου*), that thus the wedding may be according to the Lord, and not according to passion (*Polyc.*, 5^{2}). Moreover,

---

[1] Or "the incorruptible Eucharist, ἀγάπη ἄφθαρτος," according to the meaning which St. Ignatius seems to give to the word ἀγάπη in *Smyrn.*, 8^{2}.

Ignatius advises the keeping of perfect chastity, if it can be done, for the honor of the Lord's flesh: but at the same time one should live in humility and not believe oneself, because of the practice of this virtue, superior to the bishop: otherwise one is lost (*ibid.*).

The picture which the Bishop of Antioch sets before us of the life and organization of Churches is completed by what he says of Christian life in each one of the faithful in particular. He represents it most assuredly just as he conceived it and strove to live it himself, in the ardor of love and eagerness for martyrdom, that were in his soul. Jesus Christ is its principle and centre. He is our life, not only in as much as He brought us eternal life, but also because, dwelling personally in us, He is in us a true and indefectible principle of life (*τὸ ἀδιάκριτον ἡμῶν ζῆν, τὸ διὰ παντὸς ἡμῶν ζῆν, τὸ ἀληθινὸν ἡμῶν ζῆν, εἰς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ζῆν*, *Eph.*, 3^2, 11^1; *Magn.*, 1^2; cf. 15; *Smyrn.*, 4^1; cf. *Trall.*, 9^2). He dwells in us and we are His temples: He is our God within us (*Eph.*, 15^3; cf. *Magn.*, 12, 14; *Rom.*, 6^3). Hence the title of *θεοφόρος* assumed by Ignatius himself in the title of his Epistles, and the names of *θεοφόροι, ναοφόροι, χριστοφόροι, ἁγιοφόροι* he applies to the Ephesians (9^2): hence, too, the union with the flesh and spirit of Jesus Christ, with the Father and Jesus, that he wishes to the Churches (*Magn.*, 1^2).

The condition and, at the same time, the expression of that life of Jesus in us are faith and love: "Nothing shall be hid from you, if you have perfect faith and charity in Christ Jesus, which are the beginning and end of life: the beginning is faith, the end, charity (*ἀρχὴ μὲν πίστις, τέλος δὲ ἀγάπη*): these two joined together are God Himself; all other things are the consequences of these for a holy life" (*Eph.*, 14^1). "That which is all, is faith and charity, than which nothing is more precious" (*Smyrn.*, 6^1; cf. *Philad.*, 9^2; *Eph.*, 9^1). Ignatius goes so far as to say that he who professes faith does not sin, just as he who possesses charity does not hate (*Eph.*, 14^2), and probably in the same meaning too, he affirms that "they that are of the flesh cannot do the works of the Spirit, nor they that are of the Spirit, the works of the flesh; as faith [cannot do the works] of infidelity, nor infidelity, those of faith. Those things that you do according to the flesh are spiritual, since you do all things in Jesus Christ." (*Eph.*, 8^{2}).

This charity, so intense in the heart of the Bishop of Antioch, leads him also to the love of sufferings and to the thirst after martyrdom: on this topic the classical passages of the Epistle to the Trallians ($4^{1,2}$), and chiefly of the Epistle to the Romans (4^{1}, $5^{2,3}$ and *passim*), are well known. But it inspires him too with accents of an impassioned mysticism: "My love is crucified and there is no fire in me for what is material; but there is a water living and speaking that says to me interiorly: Come to the Father" (*Rom.*, 7^{2}).

These sufferings Ignatius knows shall be rewarded. While false teachers and they that listen to them go to the eternal fire (*εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον*, *Eph.*, 16^{2}) unless they repent—and Ignatius thinks they shall repent with difficulty, though Jesus Christ can change them (*Smyrn.*, 4^{1}; cf. *Eph.*, 10^{1}; *Philad.*, 3^{2}) —, the martyrs go to God (*Eph.*, 2^{12}). God shall raise up in Jesus all those who believe in Jesus (*Trall.*, 9^{2}). The greater is the suffering, the greater will be the reward (*ὅπου πλείων κόπος, πολὺ κέρδος*, *Polyc.*, 1^{3}), and our good works are like deposits we shall find again (*Polyc.*, 6^{2}). The prize here proposed is incorruptibility and life everlasting (*τὸ θέμα ἀφθαρσία καὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος*, *Polyc.*, 2^{3}).

§ 6. — The Epistle and the "Martyrium" of St. Polycarp. Papias.

The only Epistle of St. Polycarp that we possess is closely connected with the Epistles of St. Ignatius, which it mentions (13^{2}). It is scarcely anything more than a moral exhortation, of the same kind as St. Clement's first Epistle, that sets before us clearly enough what were the topics of preaching in those distant ages. However, in it we find also some dogmatic elements.

As St. Ignatius and St. John in their Epistles, the author affirms most emphatically against the Docetæ the existence of a real body and of real sufferings in Jesus (7^1). Moreover, Jesus Christ, he says, was holy, and still He has borne for us our sins on the cross; He died for our sins, and thus has become our hope, the pledge of our justice (1^2, 8^1). The Son of God and eternal Pontiff, now glorified at the Father's right hand, He will be, one day, the judge of mankind (2^1, 6^2, 12^2). Away with the *ψευδοδιδασκαλία* that denies the resurrection and the judgment; he who holds that teaching is the first-born of Satan ($7^{1, 2}$).

We are saved by grace, by the will of God, not by our works (*χάριτι . . . οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, ἀλλὰ θελήματι θεοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, 1^3); nevertheless, if we wish to rise and rule with Jesus, we must walk in the precepts of God and live in a manner worthy of Jesus Christ (2^2, 5^2). Faith is followed by hope, but preceded by charity towards God, Jesus Christ and the neighbor; any one who practises these virtues has fulfilled justice ($3^{2, 3}$).

As regards the ecclesiastical hierarchy, Polycarp supposes most clearly it consists of three degrees. In chapter 6^1, he tells us of the virtues to be practised by priests (*πρεσβύτεροι*), and in the inscription of his Epistle, he associates with himself those of his Church. Likewise, in chapter 5^2, he speaks of the deacons and of the qualities required from them. Priests and deacons we must obey, as we would God Himself (5^3).

Richer in doctrinal data is, in certain respects, the relation of St. Polycarp's martyrdom, that was sent by the Church of Smyrna to that of Philomelium, in the year which followed his death (155–156). Chapter 14^{3} contains a precise trinitarian doxology. Polycarp concludes his prayer by glorifying not only the Father through the Son, but also the Son Himself and the Holy Ghost: *δι’ οὗ (παιδός) σοὶ σὺν αὐτῷ καὶ πνεύματι ἀγίῳ δόξα κτλ.* Jesus Christ is the *παῖς θεοῦ, παῖς μονογενὴς θεοῦ* ($14^{1, 3}$, 20^{2}, liturgical formulas) but also *υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*, whom we adore (*προσκυνοῦμεν*) whereas the martyrs are only loved (17^{3}). He is the heavenly and eternal Pontiff (14^{3}); He died for the salvation of all the elect, He, innocent, for sinners (17^{2}).

The author of the *Martyrium* already regards the Church catholic as forming a whole: his relation is addressed "to the Church of God that sojourns at Philomelium, and to all the communities (*παροικίαις*) of the holy and catholic Church in every place" (*Subscript.*, cf. 8^{1}, 19^{2}). We may remark, however, that the epithet *καθολική* is given to the Church of Smyrna taken by itself (16^{2}).

Christians ought not, of their own accord, to offer themselves to the persecutors and to martyrdom: this the Gospel does not advise (4); but they must, when the opportunity presents itself, bear courageously tortures inflicted on them, in view of the blessings in store for those who suffer with patience. For, with one hour of sufferings, they may free themselves from an everlasting chastisement, from the eternal fire reserved to the wicked (2^{3}, 11^{2}): while, at the same time, they become worthy of the resurrection of the body and soul unto eternal life, the crown of immortality (14^{2}, 17^{1}, 19^{2}).

But the most important dogmatic passages of the *Martyrium* are, assuredly, chapters 17 and 18, which refer to the relics of St. Polycarp. We find clearly pointed out therein (1) the difference between the worship paid to Jesus Christ (*σέβεσθαι, προςκυνοῦμεν*) and the love shown for the Saints and their relics (*ἀγαπῶμεν*); — (2) the care to collect the remains of martyrs and the honors rendered to these remains; — (3) In fine, the celebration of the *dies natalis* of the confessors of the faith, and the gladness brought about by the memory of their triumphs.

Of Papias [1] we have only a few fragments, the chief of which, for our purpose, is the one given by St. Irenæus (*Adv. haeres.*, V, 33, 3, ff.). Papias describes therein with "naiveté" and in realistic colors the wonderful fecundity of the earth during the future reign of Christ in this world: for, from Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.*, III, 39, 12), we know that the Bishop of Hierapolis admitted a dominion of Jesus Christ upon earth, for a thousand years, after the resurrection of the dead. — We have already noticed the regard Papias had for oral tradition; moreover we may notice also his testimony on the redaction of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark: a testimony to which critics have paid much attention (EUSEBIUS, *H. E.*, III, 39, 15, 16).

§ 7. — The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles.[2]

The *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* is a kind of catechism for the use of the faithful, which is clearly divided into three parts: a moral part (1–6), a disciplinary part (7–15), and an eschatological part (16).

"Two ways there are — one of life, the other of death, but there is a great difference between the two" (1^1). Such is the beginning of the *Teaching*. Then, chapters 1–4 expose what ought to be done or avoided to remain in the way of life; chapter 5, what constitutes the way of death. We may notice chapter 4^{14}: "In the Church thou shalt confess (ἐξομολογήσῃ) thy sins, and shalt not come forward to the prayer with an evil conscience;" in chapter $6^{2,3}$, we find also an allusion to the Evangelical counsels (cf. 1^{4}) and the prohibition to eat meats offered to idols.

---

[1] E. H. HALL, *Papias and his Contemporaries*, Boston, 1899.

[2] O. KNOOP, *Der dogmatische Inhalt der Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων*, Posen, 1888; C. TAYLOR, *An Essay on the doctrine of the Didache*, Cambridge, 1889; E. JACQUIER, *La doctrine des douze Apôtres et ses enseignements*, Paris, 1891; V. BIESENTHAL, *Die urchristliche Kirche in Lehre und Leben nach der Διδαχὴ τ. δ. ἀ. . . .*, Insterburg, 1893; O. MOE, *Die Apostellehre und der Dekalog im Unterrichte der alten Kirche*, Gütersloh, 1896; H. HEMMER and others, *La Doctrine des Apôtres*, Paris, 1907, in the series *Textes et Documents.*

In the disciplinary section, ecclesiastical rites and functions are treated. Baptism must be preceded by a moral instruction given to the catechumen (7^{1}): it is administered εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ($7^{1,3}$), though chapter 9^{5} speaks of those who are baptized εἰς ὄνομα κυρίου. Cold spring-water, or in its absence, stagnant or warm water is used ($7^{1,2}$). If the amount of water does not suffice for immersion, water will be poured (ἔκχεον) three times on the head in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost (7^{3}). Before Baptism, both he who administers it and the candidate to be baptized ought to fast, as well as other persons too, if possible (7^{4}).

The fourth and sixth days of the week are fast-days (8^{1}). The prayer prescribed is the *Pater*, three times a day ($8^{2,3}$).

The Eucharist is spoken of in the Didache certainly in chapter 14, probably also in chapters 9 and 10.[1] The word εὐχαριστία surely designates the sanctified material elements (9^{5}), as the word κλάσμα designates both the breaking of the bread (9^{3}) and the broken bread itself (9^{4}). The liturgical formulas of chapter 9 contain neither the narrative nor the words of the institution of the Eucharist; and in verses 2 and 3, thanksgiving for the cup is placed before that which is said over the κλάσμα, though in number 5, first the eating, then the drinking of the Eucharist is mentioned. In these formulas and in those of chapter 10, Jesus Christ is called *παῖς θεοῦ* ($9^{2,3}$, $10^{2,3}$); the breaking of bread is set forth as a symbol of the gathering of the members of the Church into God's kingdom (9^{4}); the Eucharist is called a spiritual food and drink (10^{3}), which only those who are baptized can receive, " for in regard to this the Lord hath said: Give not to dogs that which is holy (9^{5})."

---

[1] Several scholars are inclined to see in the whole of these two chapters or in a part of them a regulation of the agape. P. Ladeuze, *L'Eucharistie et les repas communs des fidèles dans la Didache*, in *Revue de l'Orient chrétien*, 1902, pp. 339–359; Funk, *Patres Apostolici*, vol. I, p. 22, note. Cf. Batiffol, *Études d'Histoire et de Théologie Positive*, 1st series, Paris, 1904, pp. 294, foll.

In chapter 14, though mention is made of the breaking of bread only, there is no doubt that this expression designates the whole eucharistic liturgy (cf. *Acts*, 2^{46}, $20^{7,11}$; 1 *Cor.*, 10^{16}). There we read that the giving of thanks must be preceded by a certain confession of sins (1) and that enemies must be reconciled, before they take part in the meeting (2). The liturgical service takes place chiefly on Sunday.

Twice also, as has been already seen, the Didache speaks of confession of sins (4^{14}, 14^{1}), but without indicating its precise nature and form; though it implies that this form has a certain official character (*ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ*, 4^{14}).

As regards the ecclesiastical ministry, our document distinguishes five orders of persons by whom it is exercised: the apostle (*ἀπόστολος*), the prophet (*προφήτης*), the teacher (*διδάσκαλος*), the overseers (*ἐπίσκοποι*), the deacons (*διάκονοι*): nowhere is mention made of *πρεσβύτεροι*.

The apostle is the missionary always travelling, going from one community to another, or preaching the Gospel to the heathen. He must be welcomed as the Lord Himself (11^{4}), but he must stay in the community only one or two days (11^{5}), and, when he leaves, receive only the bread sufficient to sustain his life until the next stop (11^{6}).

The prophet is he who speaks and teaches in Spirit (*λαλῶν ἐν πνεύματι*, $11^{7,8}$). If he has been tried already and acknowledged truthful, he shall not be tried again nor judged, even supposing that he does things the meaning and purpose of which escape our knowledge ($11^{7,11}$); otherwise, he shall be known and judged from his works (11^{8-12}). The *Teaching* assigns to prophets the first rank in importance among the Church ministers: it places them on the same level as the High Priests of the Old Law (*ἀρχιερεῖς ὑμῶν*) and grants them as such the right to receive the first fruits of everything (13^{3-7}); moreover, it supposes that such dignitaries were not found in all Christian communities (13^{4}).

The teacher (*διδάσκαλος*) had probably for his function to instruct the faithful; but, differently from the prophet, he did not speak in Spirit; his knowledge was an acquired knowledge, and his words had to be prepared. He also was subject to a trial ($11^{1,2}$; 13^{2}).

After the apostles, prophets and teachers, the *Teaching* mentions the overseers and the deacons. The place where they are mentioned — immediately after what pertains to the Sunday liturgical service — and the particle *οὖν* (15^{1}) which joins what is said of these ministers to what precedes, show that they are considered, in the document, as ministers of the breaking of bread, which the author has just spoken of. Every community ought to choose for itself from among the virtuous men, overseers and deacons, who may fulfil the functions of the prophets and teachers, and must be honored, just as they are ($15^{1,2}$).

As we have said, our document concludes, in chapter 15, with an eschatological instruction. It reproduces fairly well the details of the Synoptists and St. Paul: the uncertainty of the hour of the Lord's coming (^{1,2}); the signs that herald this advent (^{3,4}); the apparition of a seducer as Son of God (^{4}); the scandalizing of many (^{5}); the preliminaries of the parousia and the resurrection of the dead (^{6}), not indeed of all, but of the saints only (^{7}), and finally the apparition of Jesus Christ on the clouds of heaven (^{8}). Thus ends the *Didache:* it gives no more details as to the state of the just and of the wicked.

§ 8. — The Epistle of Barnabas.[1]

The Epistle of the Pseudo-Barnabas, which seems to come from a man of mediocre ability, is divided into two rather unequal parts: the first, from chapter 1 to chapter 17; the second, from chapter 18 to chapter 21. This last section, bearing exclusively on moral topics, reproduces quite closely the exposition of the *Two ways* we have found in the *Didache*. The first is a defence of Christianity or rather a bitter attack upon Judaism and its observances. Not only does the author present these as the figure and preparation of the New Law, which were to disappear when it came; he affirms, moreover, that the literal sense in which they were understood by the Jews was by no means the one God intended, even immediately. Thus it is only of a contrite heart and of aversion to evil, of the mortification of the senses and passions, that the bloody sacrifices, fasts and circumcision prescribed by the Law should be understood (2^{4-10}, 3^{1-5}, 9). This is the deeper knowledge, the gnosis (γνῶσις), which the Jews did not possess, deceived as they were by a wicked angel (6^9, 13^7, 9^4). The method is easily recognized: — an exaggerated allegorism turning against Judaism that very Law which made its glory.

In this strange writing, doctrinal elements are rather few. Some however, which are connected with the author's standpoint, are worth mentioning. The Pseudo-Barnabas is quite affirmative on the preëxistence of Jesus Christ: to the Lord, to the Son, the words were said by the Father, in the beginning: "Let us make man to our image" (5^{5}, 6^{12}). This Son has appeared in the flesh, which was a veil quite necessary: otherwise, men, who cannot fasten their eyes on the sun, a work of His hands, would have been unable to contemplate Him directly. He is not the Son of man, but the Son of God manifested in figure in the flesh (*τύπῳ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθείς*), and as later on Christ was to be regarded as the son of David, David himself declared beforehand that He was not his son, but his Lord (7^{2}, $12^{8, 10, 11}$).

---

[1] O. Braunsberger, *Der apostel Barnabas, sein Leben und der ihm beigelegte Briefe*, Mentz, 1876; D. Völter, *Der Barnabasbrief neu untersucht, Jahrb. f. protest. Theol.*, vol. XIV, 1888; P. Ladeuze, *L'Epître de Barnabé*, Louvain, 1900; V. Dölter, *Die apostolischen Väter neu untersucht*, I, Leyden, 1904; H. Hemmer and others, *Epître de Barnabé*, Paris, 1907, in the series *Textes et Documents*.

The purpose of the coming of Jesus Christ was twofold: — to fill up the measure of the Jews' sins ($5^{11, 12}$) and to redeem us. This redemption (*λύτρωσις*, 14^{6}) He accomplished by giving up His flesh to destruction, by offering it up as a sacrifice (*προσφέρειν*, *θυσία*, by sprinkling us with His blood (5^{1}, $7^{3, 5}$). Its result has been to remit our sins, destroy death and bring about resurrection from the dead, to quicken us and make of us a new nation, a holy people, the heir of the promises, instead of the Jewish nation ($5^{1, 6, 7}$, 7^{2}, 13, 14^{4-6}, $4^{7, 8}$).

We enter into the participation of this redemption, by Baptism which brings to us the remission of sins: "We descend into the water full of sins and stains, and we come out of it bearing fruits, having in our hearts the fear, and in our minds the hope, in Jesus" ($11^{11, 1, 8}$). In keeping with the *Two ways*, a confession of sins is mentioned in chapter 19^{12}: *ἐξομολογήσῃ ἐπὶ ἁμαρτίαις σου.*

The Epistle of Barnabas tells us, in chapter $16^{8, 9}$, what is the new life to which Baptism begets us: "By the remission of sins that we receive, and the hope in the name [of the Lord] we become new, being wholly created again. This is why God truly resides in us, in our dwelling. How? His word of faith, His calling, His promise, the wisdom of commands, the precepts of doctrine, He himself prophesying and dwelling in us, opening the door of the temple,viz., the mouth, to us who are given up to death, all this inspires us with penance and introduces us into the incorruptible temple." As to good works, the author proclaims unhesitatingly their necessity for salvation. Of course, the New Law is *ἄνευ ζυγοῦ ἀνάγκης* (without the yoke of necessity), and in opposition to the sacrifices of old, its sacrifice is *μὴ ἀνθρωποίητος* (not made by man, 2^{6}); still, we ought to work with our hands (*διὰ χειρῶν σου*) for the redemption of our sins (19^{10}). "He that shall fulfil these [commands of the Lord] shall be glorified in the kingdom of God; he that shall depart from them shall perish with his works. Hence the resurrection, hence the retribution" (*ἀνταπόδομα*, 21^{1}; cf. 4^{12}, 19^{11}). To some, eternal life; to others, eternal death in the midst of torments (8^{5}, 20^{1}).

The thought of the judgment is one of the chief motives of honest living, invoked by the author of our Epistle, and we find in his work, not only preoccupation about the last day, but also interesting calculations. Sometimes he seems to regard the end of the world as very near (4^{3}, 21^{3}; cf. $7^{7, 8, 24}$); but in chapter 15^{4-9}, he gives us precise computations. The six days of creation represent 6,000 years, for one day of the Lord is of 1,000 years (cf. *Ps.* 90^{4}; 2 *Pet.*, 3^{8}). Hence the world must last 6,000 years, most of which is already past. On the seventh day, viz., at the beginning of the seventh thousand years, the Son of God shall appear; He shall destroy the time of the impious one (*τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ ἀνόμου*) — viz., of Antichrist — and judge the wicked (cf. 7^{2}). This will be the signal of rest. Everything being renewed, the just shall sanctify the seventh *millennium* with Christ; though this sabbath itself shall be only the preparation for the eighth day that shall mark the beginning of a new world. This is why we spend in joy the eighth day, the day of the resurrection of Jesus.

§ 9. — The Symbols of Faith.[1]

In order to complete this study of the state of theology during the first half of the second century, we must add a few words on the Symbols of faith then acknowledged.

It is natural that there should have existed very early a short formula, easy to remember, that would sum up the teaching of apostles and catechists, and was to be repeated by the candidates, before they were admitted to Baptism.

Some scholars are inclined to see vestiges of it in 1 *Cor.*, $15^{3, 4}$; 1 *Tim.*, 6^{13}; 2 *Tim.*, $2^{2, 8}$, 4^{1}. But more worthy of attention are the passages to be found in some writers of the second century, that seem to be traces of a symbol, or at least to recall fixed formulas of Christian preaching and faith.

To begin with the East, such are the texts of Origen, of the presbyterium of Smyrna, of Aristides and of St. Ignatius, gathered and republished by Hahn in his *Bibliothek der Sym-*

---

[1] Caspari, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols*, Christiania, 1866; C. A. Swainson, *The Nicene and Apostles' Creed*, London, 1875; J. R. Lumby, *The History of the Creeds*, 2nd ed., London, 1880; C. A. Heurtley, *A History of the earlier formularies of faith of the Western and Eastern Churches*, London, 1892; Th. Zahn, *Das apostolische Symbolum, eine Skizze seiner Geschichte und sein Inhalt*, Mentz, 1893; C. L. Blume, *Das apostolische Glaubensbekenntniss. Ein apologetisch-geschichtliche Studie*, Friburg, 1893; Kattenbusch, *Das apostolische Symbol*, Leipsic, 1894; A. Harnack, *Das apostolische Glaubensbekenntniss. Ein geschichtlicher Bericht nebst einem Nachwort*, 27th ed., Berlin, 1894; J. Kunze, *Glaubensregel, Heilige Schrift und Taufbekenntniss*, Leipsic, 1899; A. E. Burn, *An Introduction to the Creeds and to the Te Deum*, London, 1899; H. B. Swete, *The Apostles' Creed, its relation to primitive Christianity*, 3rd ed., Cambridge, 1899; E. Vacandard, *Les Origines du Symbole des Apôtres*, in the *Revue des Questions Historiques*, vol. LXVI, 1899; W. Sanday, *Recent Research on the origin of the Creed*, in the *Journal of Theol. Studies*, vol. I, 1899–1900; A. G. Mortimer, *The Creeds. An historical and doctrinal exposition of the Apostles' . . . Creeds*, London, 1903; R. Seeberg, *Das Evangelium Christi*, Leipsic, 1905; P. Batiffol, article *Apôtres* (*Symbole des*) in the *Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique*, vol. I.

bole,[1] §§ 1, 2, 4, 8. Several authors have drawn the conclusion that, even in those remote times, the East possessed a symbol nearly determined, and they have added that this symbol, in use at the beginning of the second century, or even at the end of the first, especially in Asia Minor, had passed from that country to Rome, where it had, if not become the very formula of the symbol called of the Apostles, at least influenced its redaction. But this theory is far from being unanimously accepted. Among the arguments urged against it, the following fact has been brought forward. Those Eastern confessions of faith, previous to the Council of Nicæa, that we have now, — those of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, Arius, Alexander of Alexandria, of *De recta in Deum fide* (Hahn, §§ 14, 15, 185–186) — offer, on the contrary, among themselves, a diversity of arrangement, which cannot be accounted for, in the hypothesis of a fundamental type common to all. It is only after the Council of Nicæa that Eastern Symbols set forth in their composition the same order: — an order that reminds one of that of the Apostles' Creed; which proves that, instead of being exported from the East to Rome, that symbol had rather been imported from Rome to the East at the time of the great controversial struggles raised by Arianism.

Then, was there, in the second and third centuries, any baptismal formula generally adopted? Certainly there was, and scholars have pointed out, as a text that probably was used for the *redditio symboli* a short formula the trace of which is found in the nineteenth catechesis of St. Cyril of Jerusalem and which can be reduced to the following terms: Πιστεύω εἰς . . . πατέρα, καὶ εἰς τὸν υἱόν, καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ εἰς ἓν βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

In the West, things are far clearer. Even in the middle of the second century, we meet with a fixed formula that has been called the Symbol of the Apostles, and is nothing else than the baptismal symbol of the Roman Church.[1]

---

[1] A. Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der alten Kirche*, 3rd ed., Breslau, 1897.

The oldest Greek text that we have of it is the one reproduced by Marcellus of Ancyra in his letter to Pope Julius and dates from about the year 337;[2] the oldest Latin text is contained in an *Explanatio Symboli ad initiandos* to be found among the works of Maximus of Turin, which has been attributed by some to St. Ambrose (+397), by others to St. Nicetas of Romatiana in the fifth century (Hahn, § 34); — or again in the *Commentarius in symbolum apostolorum* of Rufinus (about 400, Hahn, § 36). Rufinus states[3] that the Church of Rome had, from the very beginning, preserved this text unchanged, while the various Churches (of the West) had made a few additions thereto: this last assertion is confirmed by facts (cf. Hahn, §§ 37, foll.).

In the fourth century, about the year 337, the formula of the Roman Symbol was, then, settled; but from the fourth century, we may go back as far as the end of the second century, for in his *Adversus Praxean* (2), *De praescriptione haereticorum* (13), and chiefly *De velandis Virginibus* (1), Tertullian gives us under the name of *regula fidei*, manifestly as to the substance, the order and even the wording, the Symbol of the Apostles, such as Rufinus knows it afterwards (Hahn, § 7).[4]

Moreover, if we take into account the similarities that can be shown to exist between this formula and some texts of St.

---

[1] St. Irenæus, *Adv. haeres.*, I, 9, 4: Οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὁ τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἀληθείας ἀκλινῆ ἐν ἑαυτῷ κατέχων, ὃν διὰ τοῦ Βαπτίσματος εἴληφε (In like manner he also who retains unchangeable in his heart the rule of the truth, which he received by means of baptism.)

[2] St. Epiph., *Haeres.* LXXII, 3; Hahn, § 17.

[3] *Op. cit.*; *P. L.*, XXI, 339.

[4] Besides, Tertullian remarks that the African Churches had received from Rome the *tessera* of faith (*De praescript.*, 36).

Justin and St. Irenæus — two Westerners by adoption — that seem to reproduce something of it (Hahn, §§ 3, 5); if we notice too the lapidary style and the forcible brevity of its composition, the absence, in its wording, of any allusion to the prevailing heresies of the second century, we shall admit undoubtedly that the Roman Symbol is coeval at least with St. Justin, we shall even place it still earlier, viz., about the beginning of the second century.

At that epoch, what was its precise tenor? We can determine it only by approximation, by making use of subsequent texts, while at the same time carefully setting aside from these texts all that is not accepted nor confirmed by the most ancient authors. This method has led to the following text: *Πιστεύω εἰς [ἕνα] θεὸν «πατέρα» παντοκράτορα, καὶ εἰς Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν, τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ παρθένου, τὸν ἐπὶ Ποιτίου Πιλάτου σταυρωθέντα, τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστάντα ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἀναβάντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς, καθήμενον ἐν δεξίᾳ τοῦ πατρός, ὅθεν ἔρχεται κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον.*

In this text, the word *ἕνα*, which was dropped afterwards, is part of the original formula: scholars suppose that it was left out at the time of the Monarchian heresy, which it seemed to favor. On the same occasion, too, according to some critics, the word *πατέρα* was added, in order that the distinction between the Father and the Son might be more sharply marked: however, this last hypothesis can be contested. *Πατέρα* is most probably primitive like *ἕνα* and does not designate the Father's person, but merely affirms the universal paternity of God as Creator.

Before concluding this chapter, we may attempt to sum up the results of this study on the Apostolic Fathers and the impressions it leaves in our minds.

In these early writings, Christology obviously remains in the path where it had been placed by St. John. God is one and rules all things; but, beside the Father, Jesus Christ is recognized, not only preëxisting, but also God as the Father is: this affirmation is veiled and obscured only in liturgical formulas or in the confused sketches of Hermas. Again, along with Jesus Christ, we find the Holy Ghost whose divinity is not directly stated, except perhaps in the *Shepherd*, in which the act of creation is ascribed to Him.

Of man in the natural state, his primitive elevation and fall, nothing is said. Nothing has been kept of St. Paul's sublime utterances on the misery of man, but the sentiment of the universality of sin, of the state of spiritual death in which the world lies, and of the necessity of a Redeemer.

This Redeemer is Jesus Christ. His twofold nature is indirectly affirmed, the unity of His person rather supposed. Elements of Soteriology are drawn from St. Paul and from the Epistle to the Hebrews. Jesus Christ is Priest, our Pontiff; His death was a sacrifice; His blood, a ransom that redeems us. But the effect of this redemption is not scientifically determined. The more common view is that it destroys sin and gives us the knowledge of the true God, life, immortality, and the hope of divine promises.

Individuals have a personal share in this redemption, and arrive at justification through faith and works. The two respective views of St. Paul and of St. James are found, sometimes separated, sometimes combined in the same author; but the latter, that of St. James, seems to be predominant. Moreover, this justification is set before us as an interior renovation; the Christian becomes the temple of God and of the Holy Ghost, or even, according to St. Ignatius, truly another Christ.

The concept of the Church in general remains almost what it was in the Apostolic writings. The Church has replaced the chosen people of old and is the assembly of the Saints, the body of Jesus Christ. She is destined to comprise all men: she is catholic. Her members are united by charity, by the mutual services they render to one another, and also by the identity of hope and faith. Then, in this vast society of souls, there are various particular communities, and each one of these communities consists of two parts: those who govern the faithful, and the faithful thus governed. It is chiefly in this point that the progress on the Apostolic period is noticeable. Side by side with the travelling missionaries, the prophets and the teachers, — extraordinary ministers of the Gospel, who were destined to disappear and seem to be unknown to St. Ignatius, — we find stationary ministers, connected with the liturgical action of the breaking of bread: — bishops, priests and deacons, the first two orders being first more or less confounded, then clearly distinguished in Syria and Asia Minor.

One enters the Church through Baptism administered in the name of the Trinity and for the remission of sins. The liturgical service, whose arrangement too develops, comprises prayer, offering and participation in the Eucharist. The latter is the body and blood of Jesus Christ, a remedy of immortality. The first beginnings of canonical penance seem to be found in Hermas and perhaps too, something of private confession in the *Didache* and the Epistle of Barnabas.

As to the precepts of morality a Christian ought to observe, we find in these last two writings an exposition of them, which has some claims to completeness. The virtues recommended here and elsewhere are chiefly those virtues that are specifically Christian, such as purity, chastity, humility, modesty, fear of God, trust in His promises, charity, union with the brethren, penance, whatever tends to keep the soul subject to God, and preserve peace in the community. Among good works, fasting and almsgiving are insisted upon. Moreover, Hermas gives a few exhortations on voluntary virginity and widowhood and even on continence between husband and wife.

One of the chief means to remain faithful to these precepts is the fear of the judgment, the thought of Christ's *parousia*. The conviction that this parousia is near at hand goes on decreasing in proportion as time elapses; still, it seems quite strong in some of these early writers. Papias and the Pseudo-Barnabas are millenarians; the others have discarded altogether the ancient concept of God's kingdom: they have simplified the eschatological crisis. All, however, have preserved the resurrection of the body, the final judgment by Jesus Christ, the everlasting torments of the wicked in fire, — the punishment for their misdeeds, — and the life, everlasting too, of the just with God — the well deserved reward of their labors. The supreme and final fruit of Redemption is represented in the form of *ἀθανασία*, of the *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*.

This is what the texts tell us as regards the doctrine held by the Christian Church, between the years 100 and 150. Still, we should not forget that our texts do not tell everything, and that consequently, that doctrine may have been far more full than the exposition of it as furnished by them.

CHAPTER IV

THE FIRST DEFORMATIONS OF CHRISTIAN DOGMA — THE HERESIES OF THE SECOND CENTURY

CHRISTIANITY came out of Judaism and spread into the heathen world, so that, at the beginning, she found herself successively or even simultaneously in contact with Jewish and with Pagan doctrines and ideas. On the one hand, her breaking off from Judaism did not take place without some rending: many converts from this religion kept for the Law an attachment that first brought about many a difficult situation and later on, caused some of them to fall completely into error: they are the Judæo-Christians. On the other hand, among the Pagans who accepted Christianity, several, who had tasted Philosophy and sought to penetrate the mysteries of the world and of life, did not content themselves with translating into a more learned tongue the Gospel revelation; they forced it into systems ready made, and foisted upon it a meaning quite incompatible with its data: they were the Gnostics. These two forms of error, — Judæo-Christianity and Gnosticism,— the result of the two kinds of surroundings in which the Gospel arose and expanded, filled all the second century. Nay, they are found in germ, even in the Apostolic time, strictly so called. Ordinarily disunited, they joined forces sometimes, especially at the beginning.

They typify, relatively to normal Christianity, and in opposite directions, two extreme tendencies it had to fight against; relating to its dogma, two heresies which perverted the understanding of it. Them we are to study, and with them Montanism and Millenarianism also, because, though these cannot be regarded as their branches or offshoots properly so called, still they and chiefly the latter, are somewhat connected in their eschatology with Judæo-Christianity.

§ 1. — Judæo-Christianity in the time of St. Paul.[1]

The Judæo-Christian error is naturally the first that we find in history. Though, even during the lifetime of the Apostles and in the picture thereof which their writings contain, it presents itself to us in two shapes: — one, exclusively Jewish, Judæo-Christianity properly so called; the other, already mixed with foreign philosophical elements, Judaizing Gnosticism whose existence we ascertain chiefly in the province of Asia. We shall take up one after the other.

Jesus had said that His personal ministry was confined to the sheep of Israel, that had perished (*Matt.*, 10^{6}), and as a matter of fact, the Gospel was preached first to the Jews alone. Should it be preached to the Gentiles also? All know how a series of providential and miraculous circumstances led the Apostles to solve the question in the affirmative:[2] a solution which history tells us was rather disliked by the circumcised Christians of Jerusalem.[3] The opposition increased, when the question came up as to whether or not the new converts from Paganism should be dispensed from legal observances. A Judaizing party, whose dealings are described in the *Acts* ($11^{1, 2}$; cf. ^{24}) protested energetically against the dispensation. Men without any appointment — false brethren, as St. Paul calls them (*Gal.*, 2^{4}) — went, from Judæa to Antioch and disturbed the community, by affirming that without circumcision, the Christian Gentiles could not be saved. The "council" of Jerusalem (*Acts*, 15^{5-34}) pronounced against them. However, they did not lose courage: a third time, they strove to preserve at least the essence of the Law, by forbidding the association of circumcised with uncircumcised Christians, and maintaining for the former the barriers that were to isolate them from the latter. As St. Paul tells us, some Christians of Jerusalem, who were no strangers to James (*τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου*) came to Antioch, and, by their very presence, intimidated St. Peter, so that he consented to an unfortunate dissimulation; for which he was rebuked by St. Paul: this is what has been called the conflict of Antioch (*Gal.*, 2^{11-14}).

---

[1] Duchesne, *Les Origines Chrétiennes*, Paris, chap. 4; *Histoire anc. de l'Eglise*, vol. I, chap. 3; Lightfoot, *Dissertations on the Apostolic Age*, London, 1892; also, the commentaries on the writings mentioned. [Duchesne's *Histoire* has been translated into English.]

[2] *Acts*, $7^{5-7, 26-40}$, 10, $11^{20, 21}$.

[3] *Acts*, $11^{1-3, 20-22}$.

In this last passage James is named. Is he the Apostle, the son of Alpheus? We are not certain about it. Had he himself sent these Christians of Jerusalem? St. Paul does not say. Anyhow, we should not wonder if this old man, who, from the testimony of St. Epiphanius,[1] was then from 85 to 88 years old, and had never left his Palestinian surroundings, had not fully realized the situation at Antioch and judged things not exactly in the same way as did Peter and Paul. But what is certain and remains well established is this: there is at Jerusalem a party that works at keeping up, as much as possible, the Jewish observances in the midst of Christianity, — a party which is Judæo-Christian not merely in its origin, but also in its doctrine and tendencies.

Its members looked upon St. Paul as their chief enemy: hence we see them do their utmost to thwart the Apostle's missionary work and ruin everywhere his authority. At Corinth, they organize a "coterie," the party of Christ, of which St. Paul says little in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, and a great deal in the second (1 *Cor.*, $1^{12, 13}$; 2 *Cor.*, 10^{7}–12). They are, he tells us, Jews, children of Abraham, who boast of their nationality and of the circumcision of their flesh ($11^{18, 22}$), and oppose to his ministry that of the Apostles by excellence (11^{5}, 12^{11}). St. Paul does not record anything precise as to their doctrine, but he frankly deals with them as false apostles, deceitful workmen disguised in the shape of apostles of Christ (11^{13}).—Among the Galatians, the same impostors are more successful: urging them to the practice of the Law (*Gal.*, 4^{21}, 5^{1-4}), they prevail on them to adopt circumcision (*Gal.*, 5^{2-6}, 6^{12-15}) and to observe days, months, times and years (*Gal.*, $4^{9, 10}$). St. Paul has to interfere, in the severe tone which we know. — Then, when at the Pentecost of the year 58, he comes back to Jerusalem after his third mission, of course the brethren rejoice; however, there is a question which preoccupies the elders gathered at the house of James. They tell the Apostle he is accused of turning away the converted Jews from the fulfilment of the Law, while those of Jerusalem are zealous for it. Hence they advise him to do away with the slander by showing himself also faithful to its prescriptions (*Acts*, 21^{17-24}). The sequel is well known. St. Paul arrives at Rome as a captive, but his adversaries do not let him go, and later on he will complain that there are some who preach Christ indeed, but with the purpose to stir up some tribulation against him then in prison (*Philip.*, 1^{15-17}).

---

[1] *Haeres.* LXXVIII, 14.

Such is the Judæo-Christian party whose centre is at Jerusalem. Among those who compose it, there must have been most certainly a great diversity of views, which will increase during the second century, when we shall study it again. We must now take a glance at the province of Asia.

§ 2. — The Beginnings of Judaizing Gnosticism. The Nicolaitans. Cerinthus.[1]

The first forms of the error in the province of Asia are known to us through five groups of documents: — St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians, the Pastoral Epistles (the Epistle to Titus being written especially for Crete), the second Epistle of St. Peter and that of St. Jude,[2] the Epistles and Apocalypse of St. John, finally the Epistles of St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp which form the connecting link between the New Testament and Ecclesiastical History strictly so called.

In the Epistle to the Colossians, written during his captivity (58–63 ?), St. Paul speaks explicitly of false doctrines that endeavor to penetrate into their Church: "Beware lest any man cheat you by philosophy and vain deceit, according to the tradition of men, according to the elements of the world, and not according to Christ" (2^{8}). In fact these errors probably tended to lower Jesus Christ and place the Angels above Him: these are the object of a special worship (2^{18}); and this is why the Apostle is intent on extolling the Saviour's dignity and presenting Him as the principle and end of creation (1^{15-17}, cf. ^{18,20}; $2^{9,10}$; cf. *Eph.*, 6^{12}). We know that the Angels played an important part in Jewish Theology; but moreover — and this is a rather characteristic feature — the doctors opposed by St. Paul prescribed a choice among the different kinds of food and insisted on the keeping of new moons, festivals and sabbaths ($2^{16,\,20-22}$). They taught a humility (*ταπεινοφροσύνη*) and a contempt for the body, that were not right ($2^{18, 23}$). Perhaps too, we should add circumcision, which is mentioned in chapter 2^{11}. At any rate, the error, thus described by the Apostle, was most certainly judaizing.

---

[1] Duchesne, *Les Origines Chrétiennes*, chap. 5; *Hist. anc. de l'Eglise*, vol. I, chap. 6; — and the other works mentioned at § 1. [Duchesne's *Histoire* has been translated into English.]

[2] Though there is the greatest obscurity as to the origin, date and addressees of these two documents, we may, after Mgr. Duchesne (*Origines Chrétiennes*, p. 46), place them side by side with the Pastoral Epistles, to which they are related. Cf. also Duchesne's *Histoire anc. de l'Eglise*, vol. I, p. 76 [English trans., p. 56.]

The Pastoral Epistles, written a few years later, depict it in stronger and more precise terms, either because the error itself had expanded or because St. Paul, addressing those who were his disciples, thought himself more free to pass judgment upon it. Anyhow, he names its leaders, Hymenæus, Alexander the coppersmith, and Philetus (1 *Tim.*, 1^{20}; 2 *Tim.*, 2^{17}, 4^{4}). Its partisans are recruited from the circumcised, many of whom are "disobedient, vain talkers, and seducers . . . who must be reproved" (*Tit.*, $1^{10, 11}$). As to their doctrine, it consists chiefly of long discussions on genealogies without end, and of foolish fables (1 *Tim.*, 1^{4}, 4^{7}); trifling questions are their delight; they quarrel among themselves about the words and meaning of the Law (1 *Tim.*, 6^{3-5}; 2 *Tim.*, 2^{14}; *Tit.*, 3^{9}); they praise highly Jewish fables, human traditions (*Tit.*, $1^{13, 14}$), so many blasphemies and devilish doctrines (1 *Tim.*, 1^{20}, 4^{1}). More especially, the Law is greatly extolled and those who extol it wish to be regarded as its doctors (1 *Tim.*, 1^{7}). Some kinds of food are placed under the ban, and marriage forbidden (1 *Tim.*, 4^{3}). These heretics proclaim that the resurrection has already taken place: which means that there is only a spiritual resurrection (2 *Tim.*, $2^{17, 18}$). Moreover, their morals are just as bad as their theories. These false doctors are seeking only for gain (1 *Tim.*, 6^{5-10}; *Tit.*, 1^{11}); under appearances of piety they have all kinds of vices (2 *Tim.*, 3^{1-5}). They seduce women, always curious (2 *Tim.*, 3^{6-7}), and perhaps on their account several young widows have departed from the right path, to follow Satan (1 *Tim.*, 5^{15}). "They profess that they know God, but in their works they deny Him, being abominable, and incredulous and to every good work reprobate." (*Tit.*, $1^{15, 16}$).

It is easy to recognize, in this graphic description, a doctrine which is certainly a compound of Judaism and incipient Gnosis. The forbidding of marriage and the denial of the resurrection of the body are not Jewish features: they come from another philosophy.[1]

We find similar errors described in the second Epistle of St. Peter and in that of St. Jude. The heretics denounced in these documents present striking analogies with those of the Pastoral Epistles, though it is not said that they were Judaizers. First, these heretics, we are told, "deny our only Master and Lord Jesus Christ" (*Jude*, 4); they despise *authority*, *κυριότης* (2 *Pet.*, 2^{10}; *Jude*, 8), a word which, perhaps, must be translated in the concrete meaning by "*the Lord*." Then they revile the "glories" (*δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες*, 2 *Pet.*, 2^{11}; *Jude*, 8), viz., probably the more perfect spirits they introduce into their mythical combinations, and into the fables skilfully framed of which mention is made in 2 *Pet.*, 1^{16}. Finally they deny the judgment and the Lord's coming (2 *Pet.*, 3^{3-7}). As to their morals, they are simply infamous: covetousness, lying, excessive eating, haughtiness, a passion for coteries are their least defects (2 *Pet.*, $2^{3, 11, 13}$; *Jude*, 11, 16, 19). These men are theorists of vice, who think only of impurity, and blaspheming what they ignore, are corrupted like beasts, in what they know naturally (2 *Pet.*, $2^{10, 13, 14}$; *Jude*, 4, 10). Woe to them, for the most awful punishments are in store for them (*Jude*, 11).

We may now consult St. John. Here again, there is a great deal of obscurity as to the place of composition, the date and addressees of his first two Epistles, the only ones with which our researches are concerned. Yet, it is probable that they belong to the last period of the Apostle's life and were written at Ephesus, the first for the neighboring Churches, the second for some person or particular Church. At any rate, St. John declares most plainly that, at the time when he writes, there are several antichrists, who have come from the ranks of Christians (1 *John*, $2^{18, 19}$). These heretics deny that Jesus is the Christ and the Son; hence they do not possess the Father (1 *John*, $2^{22, 23}$, $4^{3, 15}$). They deny also that Jesus is come in the flesh (1 *John*, $4^{2, 3}$). According to them, the Saviour, then, would be but a superior spirit, who would be neither the Son, nor the Christ, and have a body in appearance only; or even, more plainly, Jesus would be but a man, and any idea of the Incarnation of God's Son or Christ would be set aside. Such views are either Docetic or Ebionitic, and imply, in any case, the denial of Jesus Christ's divinity. — Of their morals, the Apostle says nothing.

---

[1] On the other hand, it seems that those scholars are mistaken who are inclined to see in the "genealogies without end" mentioned in the Pastoral Epistles, the Gnostic genealogies of Eons, and thence to infer the unauthentic character of these Epistles. Probably allusion is made to the fabulous patriarchal genealogies to be found in some Jewish Apocryphals. Cf. E. JACQUIER, *Histoire des Livres du Nouveau Testament*, vol. I, 3rd ed., p. 375. [English translation, pp. 264–265].

In its turn the Apocalypse condemns, on one hand, a class of people who pretend, and falsely, to be Jews, and form a synagogue of Satan (2^9, 3^9), — on the other hand, a sect which is styled of the Nicolaitans and is said to exist in the Churches of Pergamus and Thyatira (2^{14-16}, $^{20-25}$). These Nicolaitans have a doctrine, the *depths of Satan* (*τὰ βαθέα τοῦ Σατανᾶ*), according to their own words: but they teach chiefly unchastity (*πορνεία*) and the lawful eating of meats offered up to idols ($2^{14, 15, 20}$). Must we identify these two groups, the Nicolaitans and the synagogue of Satan? Probably not, for the latter seems to be made up of Jews who are not Christian. In any case, the history of the Nicolaitans is not over with St. John. St. Irenæus, who sums up the data of the Apocalypse by the words *indiscrete vivunt*,[1] adds that, before Cerinthus, they had distinguished the demiurge from the supreme God, and calls them a "fragment of the false Gnosis." Tertullian associates them with the Cainites of his time.[1] As to the authors who follow St. Hippolytus, viz., the Pseudo-Tertullian, Philastrius and St. Epiphanius,[2] the Nicolaitan system, as they expose it, is an Ophite system which most certainly is not the primitive type.

---

[1] *Adv. haeres.*, I, 26, 3; cf. CLEMENT OF ALEX., *Strom.*, II, 20 (*P. G.*, VIII, 1061); TERTULL., *Adv. Marcionem*, I, 29; the *Philosophoumena*, VII, 36; the PSEUDO-IGNATIUS, *Trall.*, 11, 2; *Philad.*, 6, 6.

Whence did those heretics get their name? According to St. Irenæus, it is derived from the deacon Nicolas (*Acts*, 6^5), who would have been their leader.[3] Clement of Alexandria does not deny this relation, but he explains it by a misunderstanding: Nicolas, whose life in the state of marriage was exemplary, used often to repeat, it seems, as a maxim and in an encratite meaning, that flesh is to be abused (*παραχρήσασθαι τῇ σαρκί*), viz., to be mortified, which his disciples would have understood, on the contrary, of an absolute license to be granted to it: hence their immorality.[4]

With the memory of St. John is also connected the memory of Cerinthus, whom the Apostle met at Ephesus, according to St. Irenæus.[5] We have about him no contemporary witness. He seems to have been a native of Egypt, and a Jew, if not by birth, at least and chiefly by religion. Afterwards he came to Asia and met St. John there. His system, as St. Irenæus exposed it at the end of the second century,[6] is this. Over all things, a supreme God; far below Him, a demiurge who ignores the supreme God, and creates the world. Jesus was born, as ordinary children, of the intercourse of Joseph and Mary; however, he is superior to other men in justice, prudence and wisdom. After his baptism, a heavenly being, the Christ, coming from the supreme God, descends upon him in the shape of a dove. He is then capable of announcing the supreme Father, so far unknown, and of working miracles. But, at the end, the Christ who, in as much as He was a spiritual being (πνευματικός), could not suffer, abandons Jesus. The latter dies and rises alone. — St. Irenæus says nothing of the ethics of Cerinthus, which, according to Philastrius and St. Epiphanius, was distinctly judaizing. He admitted, they say, the Law in part, circumcision and the sabbath. He rejected St. Paul, the Acts of the Apostles, and from the Gospels, kept only that of St. Matthew, from which, moreover, he retrenched the genealogy of Jesus Christ. The priest Caius and Dionysius of Alexandria formally accuse him of having taught a gross millenarianism.[1]

---

[1] *De Praescript. haeretic.*, 33.

[2] PSEUDO-TERTULL., *Adv. omn. haeres.*, 5; PHILAST., *De haeres.*, 33; ST. EPIPH., *Haeres.* XXV, XXVI.

[3] *Adv. haeres.*, I, 26, 3.

[4] *Strom.*, III, 4 (*P. G.*, VIII, 1129); cf. EUSEB., *H. E.*, III, 29. It is only later on that the deacon Nicolas was distinguished from the leader of the Nicolaitans (CASSIAN, *Collat.* XVIII, 16).

[5] *Adv. haeres.*, III, 3, 4; cf. EUSEB., *H. E.*, IV, 14, 6.

[6] *Adv. haeres.*, I, 26, 1, reproduced word for word by the *Philosoph.*, VII, 33, and with some additions and variants, by the PSEUDO-TERTULL., 10; PHILASTR., 36; ST. EPIPH., *Haeres.* XXVIII.

In the system of Cerinthus thus set forth, the mixture of Gnosis and Judaism is evident; but it would be rash to affirm that we really find, in Philastrius and St. Epiphanius, or even in St. Irenæus, his own original views. On the other hand, the Epistles of St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp impart to us, on the errors that were current in the province of Asia at the beginning of the second century, the testimony of contemporaries, and their testimony is quite valuable.

The doctrine of the false teachers is styled by St. Ignatius heterodoxy (ἑτεροδοξία), a foreign herb to be shunned.[2] They themselves are deceivers, who, though they speak of Jesus Christ, extol Judaism, the Sabbath, and antiquated practices.[3] Moreover, they are docetæ; they do not admit the reality of the Saviour's flesh and mysteries.[1] In consequence, they abstain from the Eucharist which they do not believe to be the Lord's flesh,[2] and deny the resurrection as well as the future judgment.[3] Of their morals, St. Ignatius says nothing precise, except that they have no charity for the poor and needy, and are constantly ready to foment coteries and schisms.[4] Elsewhere, he denounces them as hypocritical wolves that captivate the faithful through wicked pleasure (ἡδονῇ κακῇ, *Philad.*, 2^1), and he advises these to keep their body as the temple of God (*ib.*, 7^2). Must we see in these words an allusion to the immorality of the heretics?—We cannot say.

---

[1] Euseb., *H. E.*, III, 28, 2, 4, 5; cf. VII, 25, 3.

[2] *Eph.*, 7^1; *Magn.*, 8^1; *Trall.*, 6^1.

[3] *Trall.*, 6^2; *Magn.*, 8^1, 9^1, $10^{2, 3}$; *Philad.*, 6^1.

At any rate, the general impression derived from this study is clear. As described in the second half of the first, and at the beginning of the second century, by St. Paul, St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp, heresy associates, in Asia Minor, Judaism with Gnostic conceptions. Cerinthus presents the same character. As regards the writings of St. John, the second Epistle of St. Peter and that of St. Jude, they do not mention, at least explicitly, in the false doctrine they are stigmatizing, the Judaizing tendency; but besides that divergences must have naturally existed, we should not forget that, chiefly for the last two documents, we do not know exactly where those lived whom they are addressing and of whom they are speaking.

§ 3. — Judæo-Christianity in the Second Century.[5]

We have seen how there existed, from the very beginning, in the Christian Church of Jerusalem, a party strongly attached to legal observances, and anxious to maintain their practice, at least for the Jewish converts. The events that preceded the ruin of the city by Titus in 70, contributed to increase that regrettable tendency. As early as the year 68, the Christians left Jerusalem and fled beyond the Jordan, to Pella, in the kingdom of Agrippa II, whence they spread gradually into the neighboring territories. Here, in the isolation in which they found themselves, their narrow particularism did but increase. At the same time doctrinal divergences took place among them, divergences which divided them into several groups less sharply distinguished, indeed, than the following exposition will show, though these can be really distinguished one from the other.

---

[1] *Trall.*, 9, 10; *Smyrn.*, 1–6; Polyc., *ad Philip.*, 7^1.

[2] *Smyrn.*, 7^1.

[3] Polyc., *ad Philip.*, 7^1; cf. *Smyrn.*, 7^{1-2}.

[4] *Smyrn.*, 6^2, 8; *Eph.*, $5^{2,3}$; *Magn.*, 4^1; *Philad.*, 2^1; $3^{2,3}$, 4^1, etc.

[5] Duchesne, *Origines Chrétiennes*, chap. 10; *Hist. anc. de l'Eglise*, vol. I, chap. 9; Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums*, Leipsic, 1884; Hilgenfeld, *Judentum und Judenchristentum*, Leipsic, 1886; Lucius, *Der*

First there were a Nazarene group, that kept, with a strong attachment to the Law and its prescriptions, the essential points of Christian faith, and an Ebionite group that completely fell into heresy. For the sake of clearness, I designate by these terms the two sections of the ancient Church of Jerusalem, though in practice the use of these terms was indiscriminate.[1] Then, among the Ebionites, some came in contact with the Essenes, and from this contact arose — perhaps at the beginning of the second century — the variety of Ebionitism which is set forth by the Clementine apocryphals in the third century and described by St. Epiphanius in the fourth (*Haeres.* XXX). Finally on this Essene Ebionitism, there is grafted the particular sect of the Elkesaites.

Essenismus in seinem Verhältniss zum Judenthum, Strasburg, 1881; J. Langen, *Die Klemensromane, Ihre Entstehung und ihre Tendenzen aufs neue untersucht*, Gotha, 1890; C. Bigg, *The Clementine homilies. Studia biblica et ecclesiastica.* II, Oxford, 1890; F. W. Bussell, *The purpose of the world process and the problem of evil as explained in the Clementine and Lactantian writings*: *Studia bibl. et eccles.*, Oxford, 1896; H. Waitz, *Die Pseudoklementinen Homilien und Rekognitionen*, Leipsic, 1904. [Duchesne's *Histoire* has been translated into English].

[1] St. Jerome, *Epist.* 112, *ad Augustinum*, 13. Cf. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vol. I, p. 300, text and note 4 (*Lehrb. der D G.*, I, p. 285, text and note 3).

Thus, as far as we can judge, the ancient Church of Jerusalem became divided at the beginning of the second century, first into Nazarenes and Ebionites; then from the latter came the Essene Ebionites, a particular branch of whom was called the Elkesaites.

What was the doctrine of these various groups?

It does not seem that, except in their overgreat attachment to the Law and their most assuredly too narrow conception of the Gospel in general, the Nazarenes differed, in their belief, from the other Hellenic Churches. St. Jerome, who became acquainted with them at Beræa (Aleppo), declares to St. Augustine in his letter 112, 13, "that they believe in Christ, the Son of God, born of the Virgin Mary, who suffered under Pontius Pilate, and rose: in whom we believe also." He adds — it is true — that, by endeavoring to be at the same time Jews and Christians, they are neither the one nor the other: *dum volunt et iudaei esse et christiani, nec iudaei sunt nec christiani*; but what hinders them from being Christians, is only their obstinacy in living according to Jewish ways; for St. Jerome also says elsewhere that they did not reject the Apostle Paul.[1] — We may go a little farther back. Hegesippus, the author of the *Memoirs*, seems to have been a Christian of that group.[2] Still, about the year 150, he goes on a journey to the West and enters into relations with many bishops, particularly with those of Corinth and of Rome: he examines the doctrine taught in the churches and finds it in accordance with his own, "in keeping with what is preached by the Law, the Prophets and the Lord." [3] If we remark that at the very time when Hegesippus wrote (about 180), St. Irenæus represented the Ebionite sect as altogether heretical,[1] we must admit that the Judæo-Christians did not belong to it. — Finally, in his *Dialogue with Trypho* (47), St. Justin tells us of Christians who accept all the Gospel, but who remain attached to the Law of Moses. He personally believes that they can be saved and must be regarded as brethren united by the bond of Christian fellowship, provided they do not pretend to impose upon Gentile Christians these same observances. However, his sentiment, he says, is not shared by all, and there are some Christians who do not mix with them. Then, at number 48, he mentions again Jews by birth (τινὲς ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑμετέρου γένους),[2] who admit the messiahship of Jesus, but not His divinity; — an opinion, he goes on to say, that neither he nor the bulk of those with him can share.

---

[1] *In Isaiam*, lib. III, cap. IX, 1 (*P. L.*, XXIV, 125). These Nazarenes seem to be referred to by St. Epiphanius, *Haeres.* XXIX, 1, 7–9. Though he declares them to be Jews and nothing else (7), still the details that he gives prove just the contrary.

[2] Euseb., *Hist. Eccles.*, IV, 22, 7; cf. St. Jerome, *In Ezech.*, Lib. IV, cap. XVI, 13 (*P. L.*, XXV, 137).

[3] Euseb., *H. E.*, IV, 22, 1–4.

Are these Jews the same as the Christians spoken of in the preceding number? It does not look like it. Anyway, it seems quite certain that there were, in the second century and until the end of the fourth, when St. Jerome knew them, orthodox Judæo-Christians whose whole error consisted in their obstinacy in practising the Mosaic Law. Them we call Nazarenes.

Side by side with them we must place the Ebionites.[3] The origin of the name is rather uncertain, and ancient authors differ a great deal among themselves as to the way of explaining that name. The best and most natural explanation is that which derives it from the actual poverty (*ebion* in Hebrew means *poor*) of the Christian community that had migrated and settled beyond the Jordan.

---

[1] *Adv. haeres.*, I, 26, 2.

[2] Instead of ἡμετέρου, as we find in the editions of Maran and Otto, we should read ὑμετέρου (cf. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vol. I, p. 297, note 3).

[3] Sources: Hegesippus in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, IV, 22, 4–7; St. Irenæus, *Adv. haeres.*, I, 26, 2, III, 21, 2, V, 1, 3; Origen, *Contra Celsum*, II, 1, V, 61; *In Genes.*, III, 5; *In Matt.*, XVI, 12; Pseudo-Tertull., 11; Philastrius, 37; Tertull., *De Praescript.*, 33; *Philosophoumena*, VII, 34; Euseb., *Hist. Eccles.*, III, 27, VI, 17.

As we can gather it from our sources taken all together, their doctrine was as follows: There is only one God, creator and lord of the world. Jesus Christ is but a man (ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος), born of the intercourse of Joseph and Mary. However, Eusebius testifies that some of them admitted His virginal birth.[1] Because of His fidelity to observe the Law, Jesus was justified and became the Christ: though any man may become such, by following the same method. This is why the Ebionites faithfully comply with all the prescriptions of this Law, especially as regards the sabbath and circumcision, and they proclaim that such fidelity is necessary for salvation. On the other hand, they use only the Gospel of St. Matthew, the Gospel of the Hebrews, and spurn St. Paul as an apostate, the Apostle himself and his Epistles. But, just like the Christians, they celebrate the Sunday with solemnity in memory of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. St. Irenæus adds (I, 26, 2) that they explained the prophecies *curiosius*, viz., probably by mixing with those prophecies rabbinical subtleties or secret traditions.

It was about the year 100 or even somewhat earlier, that the Ebionites came in contact with the Essenes.[2] The latter are known to us through Philo, Josephus and Pliny the Elder.[3] They can be represented in general as Jews to whom ritual and legal cleanliness did not suffice, and who, perhaps disgusted with the disorders they had seen prevalent in the higher clergy of Jerusalem, had gradually seceded from the Temple and its sacrifices, in order to lead apart a more perfect life. From their relations with the Ebionites arose the special type of Ebionitism that has been called Essenian Ebionitism.

---

[1] *Hist. Eccles.*, III, 27, 2; cf. VI, 17.

[2] Cf. Schürer, *History of the Jewish People*, 2nd div., vol. II, pp. 188, foll.

[3] Philo, *Quod omnis probus sit liber*, 12, 13; and a fragment preserved by Eusebius, *Praepar. Evangel.*, VIII, 11; Josephus, *De bello iud.*, II, 8, 2–13; *Antiquit.*, XIII, 5, 9, XV, 10, 4, 5, XVIII, 1, 5; Pliny the Elder, *Hist. natur.*, V, 17. The other sources: the Philosophoumena, Eusebius, St. Epiphanius, depend on these or are of little account.

The sources of our information concerning the latter are not of the very best,[1] and we should not forget this, when we read the following exposition, derived chiefly from the Clementine *Homilies*. God is one (II, 15); He has a shape, a configuration (*μορφὴν καὶ σχῆμα*), and limbs, though not for use (*οὐ διὰ χρῆσιν*, XVII, 7–9). He it is who has made all things (II, 15)[2] according to a law that sets all beings, two by two, one against the other (*διχῶς καὶ ἐναντιῶς*, II, 15, 33), and in such a way that, though the good elements and beings were created first, and the bad ones after, still we know and experience the latter first, and after them the former (II, 16). Thus, as to men, Cain appeared before Abel, Ismael before Isaac, Esau before Jacob, Aaron (wicked, because he offered sacrifices) before Moses, John the Baptist, the son of a woman (*inter natos mulierum*), before Jesus Christ, the Son of man, Simon the Magician before St. Peter, and, at the end, Antichrist shall appear before Christ (II, 16, 17).[3]

---

[1] They are chiefly two: A. The group of the *Pseudo-Clementine Writings*, which originated within the sect, but were touched up afterwards and which, on the whole, do not go back farther than the 3rd century. They include (1) The *Homilies*, twenty in number, preceded by an Epistle of Peter to James, the *Contestatio* (*διαμαρτυρία*) of James, and a letter of Clement to the same; (2) The *Recognitions*, in ten books; (3) Two Greek *Epitomes* of the Homilies in two different redactions; (4) Two Arabic *Epitomes* of the Homilies and the Recognitions; (5) A Syriac compilation of the Homilies and the Recognitions. Cf. BARDENHEWER, *Gesch. der altkirchl. Litter.*, I, pp. 351, ff. Of these works, the *Homilies* is the one that exhibits the earliest state of the doctrine. — B. ST. EPIPHANIUS, *Haeres.* XXX. He calls these heretics Ebionites and mixes with his exposition what refers to Elkesai, though he actually aims at describing the Essenian Ebionites. The edition quoted for the Homilies and the Recognitions is that of Migne's *Greek Patrology*, I, II.

[2] However, elsewhere (XVII, 9) the Homilies offers us about God and the world a pantheistic conception.

[3] Cf. *Recognitions*, VIII, 61: Aaron has been replaced by the magicians of Egypt, John the Baptist by the Tempter, and perhaps St. Paul too by the

In keeping with that law, there have been, since the beginning of the world, two parallel series of prophets, some truthful, others deceitful; some that have come from Adam, the first prophet — whose fall is denied (III, 21), — others, that descend from Eve, inferior to Adam and created after him (III, 22). These, however, are the first to appear, and claim belief in their words (III, 23); but they cannot be but deceivers, since they represent the feminine element (III, 27). It is they who have introduced bloody sacrifices and wars (of which menstruation is an image), polytheism and error (III, 24). On the contrary, those prophets who depend on Adam came after; they are trustworthy; to speak more correctly, there has been, in reality, ever since the beginning of the world, only one prophet, who appeared first in Adam, and then "changing his name and his form, appears again and again in the world, until, his time having come, being anointed by the mercy of God, because of his labors, he shall enjoy rest for ever" (III, 20; cf. *Recognitions*, II, 22).

That prophet has manifested himself in Jesus Christ. Thus, the latter does but continue the work of Adam and Moses: his only function is to teach. On the subject of the relations between wisdom and God, the *Homilies* offers a system of extension and contraction (ἔκτασις, συστολή), which recalls that of Sabellius, as it was described in the fourth century. At any rate, though He is Son of God, Jesus is not God (XVI, 15). First of all, He never claimed such a title for Himself; and then, the characteristic of the Father is to be unbegotten, that of the Son, to be begotten; now, the begotten and the unbegotten cannot be placed on the same level: the latter is necessarily unique (XVI, 16, 17). Such a doctrine is nothing but pure Arianism.[1]

---

nation of the Gentiles in general. For it is certain that St. Paul is attacked in the *Homilies* under the mask of Simon the Magician (XVII, 13–19). The 19th chapter is quite direct.

[1] Passages such as these are evidently due to later interpolations.

To these dogmatic data we must add the affirmation of man's freedom (X, 4; XI, 8; *Recogn.*, III, 22), of the immortality of the soul (XI, 11; XVI, 16), of a divine retribution that will treat everybody according to his works (II, 36), and particularly, will inflict on the souls of the wicked the everlasting punishment of fire (XI, 11).

The ritual and moral part is a mixture of Essenism and Judaism. The *Contestatio* of James admits baptism and circumcision (1): the *Homilies* prescribes bathing at least once a day (*Hom.*, IX, 23; X, 26; XIV, 1; *Recogn.*, IV, 3; V, 36), and advises vegetarianism (*Hom.*, VIII, 15; XII, 6; XV, 7). Early marriage is obligatory, that adultery and fornication may be avoided (*Hom.*, III, 68; *Epist. Clem. ad Jacob.*, 7). On the contrary, bloody sacrifices are disapproved of (*Hom.*, III, 24, 26).

The doctrinal exposition of the Pseudo-Clementine writings is met with again in part, in St. Epiphanius (*Haeres.* XXX), whose account supplies us with a few other interesting data. According to the Ebionites, he says, Christ and the devil have been both established by God: to the devil belongs the rule of the present, to Christ, that of the future world (16). Jesus is but a man born in the ordinary way (2, 14, 16, 17, 34), though upon him Christ descended (14). Christ is either a created spirit of the superior order, or the Holy Ghost Himself (3, 13, 16), and it is He who coming upon Jesus at the latter's baptism, uttered the words: "Thou art my beloved Son" (13, 16). Jesus Christ is a prophet of truth: on the contrary, all the prophets between Moses and Him, such as David, Isaias, etc., are mere impostors (18). As regards the Sacred Books, those heretics reject a part of the Pentateuch, particularly what concerns sacrifices and the use of meats (18), receive, among the Gospels, only that of St. Matthew, which they call *κατὰ Ἑβραίους* and the text of which they have altered (3, 13, 14, 18, 22); they look on St. Paul as a liar and a cheat (16). On the other hand, they peruse certain Περιόδροι Πέτρου — a work ascribed to Clement, — and some (apocryphal) Acts of the Apostles (15, 16).

The description of their religious practices, given by St. Epiphanius, is much the same as that found in the Clementine writings. Initiated through Baptism, they celebrate every year the Holy Mysteries with unleavened bread and water (16). They have preserved the Jewish observances, like the Sabbath and circumcision, etc. (2), and, though they reject sacrifices (16), have even priests and rulers of the synagogue (18). They bathe often and at least once a day (2, 15, 17), abstain from the meat of animals (15); but they condemn continence and virginity (2): among them, marriage is earlier than it should be, and divorce is allowed (18).

These data leave no doubt as to the mixed character of the doctrine we are now considering. The frequent ablutions, the putting away of sacrifices are Essenian features. On the other hand, our three sources, viz., Philo, Josephus and Pliny, agree in saying that the Essenes did not marry, and that the sect recruited itself exclusively by the adoption or by the initiation of adult persons.[1] Hence it seems quite reasonable to admit that we find here a combination of Essenian, Jewish and Christian elements: this is Essenian Ebionitism.

From this common ground of Essenian Ebionitism arose the Elkesaite doctrine: though it is difficult to determine in a precise manner what elements the latter added to the former, and whether its supporters formed a distinct sect or were merely a group of Essenian Ebionites particularly attached to Elkesai. Moreover, this last name itself has been the subject of many conjectures.[2] Of these the most probable is that the word is a mere transcription of the Hebrew words Hêil-Kesaī "hidden force." That the personage to whom it is applied ever existed, some have doubted; however, their reasons do not seem to be conclusive.

---

[1] However, Josephus states that in the East there was a branch of the sect, in which marriage was practised, and even wives taken on trial for three years. (*De bello iudaico*, II, 8, 13).

[2] It has been written in different ways: ’Ηλχασαί (*Philosophoumena*), ’Ηλξαί: (St. Epiphanius). Origen says ‘Ελκεσαιταί.

The sect is made known to us by Origen (EUSEBIUS, *H. E.*, VI, 38) and St. Epiphanius (*Haeres.* XXIX, XXX, LIII), who speak for the East, and by the author of the *Philosophoumena* (IX, 13–17), for the West. The latter tells us that, under Callistus, a certain Alcibiades endeavored to introduce the Elkesaite doctrine at Rome. This doctrine, which was contained in the book of Elkesai, had been revealed by a gigantic angel who was called the Son of God, and was attended by a female angel, the Holy Spirit, whose dimensions were similar.[1] It was promulgated by Elkesai in the third year of Trajan (in the year 100). It consisted essentially in the preaching of a baptism which was distinct from that of Jesus, and remitted all sins, even the most grievous, as soon as it was received with faith in the new revelation. The candidate for baptism was plunged fully clad into the water and, while the ceremony was going on, invoked the seven witnesses, viz., heaven, water, the holy spirits, the spirits of prayer, oil, salt and bread. To this were added magical formulæ, strange incantations, predictions of the future, the divisions of days into days of good and evil omen, combinations of numbers, — the whole paraphernalia of astrology. Besides, the observances prescribed by the Jewish Law were still retained; among them circumcision. As to Jesus, He was thought to have been born like ordinary men, from carnal intercourse; though, according to the doctrine of metempsychosis, His birth from Mary was a second birth; for He had already and successively passed into several bodies and lived in this world under other names. The *Philosophoumena* draws attention to the fact that the Elkesaites kept their tenets secret.

---

[1] The fact that the Hebrew word *rouah*, "spirit," is of the feminine gender, has led a certain number of sects to regard the Holy Spirit as a female being. Cf. the fragment of the Gospel of the Hebrews, quoted by Origen, *In Ieremiam*, hom. XV, 4; Lomm., XV, 284.

These data, the earliest that we possess on this sect, are confirmed by Origen and St. Epiphanius. The former adds that the heretics rejected a part of Scripture, as well as the authority of the Apostles, and declared it lawful, in case of necessity, to deny Christ with the lips, provided such a denial did not come from the heart. The special details supplied by St. Epiphanius represent the sect as a mere variety of Essenian Ebionitism. The disciples of Elkesai, he continues, are truly the Sampseans (*Σαμψαῖοί, sunny*),[1] who are really neither Jews, nor Gentiles, nor Christians.

From this exposition we may infer that some pythagorean doctrines had crept into Essenian Ebionitism, and by means of Elkesaitism had affected its tenets: this is explicitly remarked by the *Philosophoumena*. So, while Pythagorism did not influence the first stages of Essenism, it did influence the last stages of this religious system, which was not benefited therefrom, nor from contact with other doctrines that gradually united with it.

On the other hand, this study shows the rather insignificant place held by Jewish Christianity in the history of early Christianity, and the small influence it exercised on the development of her dogma. Its pretensions were soon annihilated both by the straight and direct blows it had received at St. Paul's hands, and by the numerical superiority soon acquired by Gentile Christians. True, it could and did disturb the Church for a while, and made it necessary for Ignatius and Pseudo-Barnabas — among others — to raise protestations; but it could not seriously alarm her nor impede her steps.

---

[1] Probably so called because the Essenes with whom they were connected invoked or seemed to invoke the sun at its rising (JOSEPH., *De bello iud.*, II, VIII, 5).

In its struggle against the expansive Christian Idea, sustained by the resources of Greek philosophy which the Apologists were soon to place at her disposal, Judaism, whose metaphysical powers were quite limited, could not win the day. Hence we see the transjordanic colonies of the Church of Jerusalem sink rapidly into the condition of obscure sects, and that Jewish Christian element which remains faithful to the essential points of Christianity, become in the fourth century, for St. Jerome and St. Epiphanius, an object rather of curiosity than of serious study. The traditional standing of the Nazarenes would seem to have called for better treatment: for, after all, the Nazarenes originated from the primitive nucleus of nascent Christianity. But on account of their small number they were overlooked: in the midst of the universal Church, they were like a solitary islet, a group scarcely visible, which attracted attention only by its peculiarities.

§ 4. — Gnosticism.[1]

The name of Gnosticism is given to a whole collection of systems which arose in the early years of the second century and some of which survived even till the fifth century and later; and which, on the whole, represent either an effort of philosophic thought to absorb Christianity and transform it into a mere religious philosophy or an effort of religious thought to find in the same Christianity a deeper meaning than the simplicity of the Gospel allowed, and to transform it into a mystagogy of initiations and dreams. In either case, it was a science of a higher order (γνῶσις), which pretended to take the place of common and ordinary faith (πίστις). The gnostic was thought to understand his belief and to have penetrated its mystery.

---

[1] Sources: (1) Gnostic writings and fragments of Gnostic writings: the *Epistles of Ptolemy to Flora* (St. Epiphanius, *Haer.* XXXIII, 3, ff., cf. *P. G.*, VII, 1281, ff.); the *Pistis sophia* (edit. Petermann-Schwartze, Berlin, 1851, 1853); the *Book of the great Logos* or *Book of Jeü*, and another work, without any title in the papyri of Bruce (edit. C. Schmidt, *Gnostische Schriften in koptischen Sprachen aus dem Codex Brucianus herausgegeben*, etc., *Texte und Untersuch.*, VIII, Leipsic, 1892). The collection of the fragments is found in Grabe, *Spicilegium*, II; Massuet, *P. G.*, VII, 1263, ff.; Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums*, Leipsic, 1884. Cf. also Clement of Alexandria, *Excerpta Theodoti.* — (2) The catalogues and refutations of heresies: St. Irenæus, *Adversus haereses libri V*; St. Hippolytus, *Syntagma contra omnes haereses*, a work which is not extant, but is well represented by Pseudo-Tertullian, *Liber adversus omnes haereses*; Philastrius, *De haeresibus liber*, and St. Epiphanius, *Panaria*; *Philosophoumena, sive Haeresium omnium confutatio* (edit. Cruice); Adamantius, *De recta in Deum fide.* To these we must add the special treatises and instructions left by Clement of Alexandria, Origen,

For, though Christianity furnished an authoritative solution of the great problems studied by the human mind, still it did not pretend to give a strictly so called explanation of those problems. Hence, even after one had accepted the Christian belief, there was room for further researches of which this Christian belief might be the starting-point, and a clear and well-balanced philosophy, the instrument. This was the Christian Gnosis, as understood by Clement of Alexandria and Origen. Unfortunately, instead of this cautious philosophy, which is nothing but the best exercise of reason, Gnostics, in order to clear up their faith, made use of both a degenerate Platonism that tended toward Pantheism and a superstitious Neo-Pythagorism that tended towards magic. Moreover, in order to avail themselves, for the same purpose, of the elements of truth which they thought were contained in the

---

Tertullian, Eusebius and other ecclesiastical historians, and moreover PLOTINUS, Πρὸς τοὺς γνωστικούς, in the Enneades. — Works: DUCHESNE, *Origines Chrétiennes*, chap. XI; *Hist. anc. de l'Eglise*, vol. I, chap. xi; LIPSIUS, *Der Gnosticismus, sein Wesen, Ursprungund Entwicklungsgang*, Leipsic, 1860; MANSEL, *The Gnostic Heresies*, London, 1875; KOFFMANE, *Die Gnosis nach Tendenz und Organisation*, Breslau, 1881; HILGENFELD, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums*, Leipsic, 1884; E. DE FAYE, *Introduction à l'histoire du gnosticisme*, Paris, 1903. — As to the literature referring to each particular sect, cf. BARDENHEWER, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Litter.*, I, pp. 318, ff. [Duchesne's *Histoire* has been translated into English.]

religions of old, they borrowed the secret rites and initiations of pagan mysteries, which, as is well known, were much in vogue during the second century, or they transported into the teachings of the Church the theogonic and cosmogonic doctrines of Egypt, Chaldea, Persia, and perhaps even those of India known at Alexandria and in Syria. To these elements of inferior quality was added an exegesis altogether too allegorizing, and consequently a method which could but lead to interpretations at the same time erroneous and fantastic. So, imagination was let loose, as it were, and the Christian world of that time saw strange, complex and shocking systems rise from these injudicious combinations into which the Gospel was made to enter: — systems about which we may ask ourselves how they could ever have been upheld by reasonable beings or seriously proposed, maintained and defended.

Nevertheless, these oddities should not make us lose sight of the importance of the problems taken up by Gnosis, nor of the earnestness which some of its teachers brought to their study. "*Eadem materia apud haereticos et philosophos volutatur: iidem retractatus implicantur: Unde malum et qua in re? Unde homo et quomodo, et quod maxime Valentinus proposuit: unde Deus?*" Thus does Tertullian[1] sum up the questions which the heretics aimed at solving, and which were of so great an importance: the nature of God, the nature of man and his origin, the reason for the existence of evil. Then, in the Gnostic systems themselves, we must carefully distinguish the staple of their teaching from the images by means of which that teaching was set forth, and from the more or less symbolical narratives in which it was embodied. Those images and narratives, which were used chiefly in the liturgical service, did not belong to the essence of the doctrine: they were more undetermined and treated with a certain amount of freedom.

---

[1] *De Praescript.*, 7; cf. CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, 78.

Such, then, was the end Gnosticism had in view, such, too, the means it used to reach that end. Now, as regards the sources of our knowledge of the system itself, all are not of equal value. The Gnostic writings, — the first authoritative source that should be consulted, — have almost entirely disappeared: scarcely four or five entire pieces have been preserved, besides the quotations and fragments, sometimes lengthy, inserted by heresiographers in their works.[1] St. Justin's catalogue of heresies has been lost, and to reconstruct it seems to be impossible. At the time of St. Irenæus, the earliest author whose writings against Gnosticism have come down to us, the latter had already evolved, and it is probable that, in spite of his having used ancient documents (cf. chiefly *Adv. haeres.*, I, 22–27) the Bishop of Lyons in describing the heresy at its birth, gave to it many features that appeared only later on. True, the *Syntagma* of St. Hippolytus is met with in the three authors — the Pseudo-Tertullian, Philastrius and St. Epiphanius — who borrowed from it; still we have not the text itself; and as to the documents analyzed by the *Philosophoumena*, probably, — granting their authenticity, — they do not go back farther than the beginning of the third, or the end of the second century. We pass by the data supplied by Origen and Tertullian: those given by Clement of Alexandria are nearer to the sources and therefore more valuable.

From this exposition it follows that we know but imperfectly the true nature of the Gnostic systems during their first fifty years — from 120 to about 170 — as well as the precise doctrine of those who propounded them. The only result we can get from the study of our sources seems to be this: we must distinguish two periods in the history of Gnosticism. The first includes the second century. Gnosticism, whose symptoms, as we have seen, can be found among the errors referred to in

---

[1] HARNACK, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litter.*, *Die Ueberliefer*, pages 152, ff., 918; BARDENHEWER, *Gesch. der altkirchlichen Litter.*, I, pages 318, foll.

St. Paul's Epistles, appears then, at the epoch of Hadrian and Antoninus (117–161), with Menander, Saturninus, Basilides, Valentinus and Carpocrates as its advocates, and develops in a normal way until the end of the century. This first phase is characterized, at least in the beginning, by the intellectual and often moral excellence of the founders of the sects, by the philosophical tendency of the systems, and by the well defined distinctions of the various schools. Then, at the beginning of the third century, a second period opens. New sects appear and multiply most abundantly, bearing strange names and started by men unknown or of inferior ability. Their systems absorb gradually the great theories of the previous age, and at the same time tend to unite together, so as to become nothing but varieties on a common doctrinal ground. Moreover, the philosophical element gives place to the purely religious or even magical element. Instead of reason, revelations recorded in apocryphal books that are quite numerous, are resorted to; instead of instructions, rites and mysterious ceremonies are multiplied: far from gaining, the standard of morality loses by such a change, and some sects reach the very lowest stage of degradation: this is why they conceal their teaching, nay their very existence, and it is often only by a lucky chance that we have come to know them. A classification of the various Gnostic systems is not easy; they form a group too complex and too imperfectly known, to be arranged in a satisfactory way; at all events, scholars have not been successful in this task, and the classifications that have been proposed are greatly subjective and necessarily differ according to the standpoint from which they have been made. The one most generally accepted starts from the geographical point of view and divides the systems into two great categories. The first comprises those which come from Syria and have borrowed from the Syrian, Chaldean, and Persian religions, constituting the *Syrian* Gnosis the chief representatives of which are Simon the Magician, Menander, Saturninus, the Ophites mentioned by St. Irenæus, the Cainites and Justin. The second includes the systems that arose in Egypt and have borrowed from its religion of old; this is called the *Alexandrian* Gnosis, with which we must connect Basilides, Valentinus and his disciples (Ptolemy and Heracleon, for the Italian school; Theodotus, Marcus, Secundus and Axionicus, for the Oriental school), Carpocrates and Epiphanes, the Docetæ, and the Alexandrian Ophites (Naassenes, Peratæ, Sethites, etc.). Marcionitism, which is often presented as a branch of Gnosis, offers special features and therefore must be studied by itself.

The reader should not expect from us a detailed account of all these systems: this would be a task both irksome and little necessary, and incapable of being carried out within the limits of this book. We have thought it better to point out the chief characteristic doctrines of those systems, while noting down, at the proper place, their most important differences.

The supreme God is generally represented as unique. Among the divine beings that surround Him, — whether they emanate from Him or not, — He appears as the only one of His kind.[1] In some systems, — v. g. that of the Ophites, known to us through St. Irenæus, — evident traces of the Christian Trinity may be found; according to them, the first principle comprises the Father (the first man), the Son (Ennoia, the second man), and the Holy Ghost, who is spoken of as a female being.[2]

This first principle, supreme God and Father of all things, is unknown to the lower world, nay often to the beings that are nearest to Him. The tendency is to make of Him an abstraction (*βύθος, ὁ οὐκ ὢν θεός*): — a tendency which is nothing but a refinement of Platonism or a derivation from those cosmogonies of old which looked upon chaos and the abyss, viz., the utmost lack of light and order, as the source of cosmos.

---

[1] *Ptolemaei ad Floram Epistula*, *P. G.*, VII, 1289.

[2] *Adv. haeres.*, I, 30, 1.

Between the supreme God and the inferior world, there is a suprasensible world, which has emanated — so most say — from the first principle, and is to fill up the space between the infinite and the finite, the absolute and the relative, and to explain creation: it is called the pleroma, the "ogdoad." It is made up, sometimes of beings that seem to be quite real and concrete, as in the Syrian Gnosis generally, sometimes, as in the systems of Simon and Valentinus, of abstractions and passions personified and presented two by two, as the male and the female element, forming syzygies, as it were: *νοῦς* and *ἐπίνοια*, *φωνή* and *ὄνομα*, or again Spirit and Truth, Word and Life, etc. Among these eons, we must remark especially the eon Christ or Jesus, who afterwards came down upon the Redeemer.[1]

Creation originates from one or several of these eons inferior to the Father of all things.[2] For matter and spirit are not looked upon as two different forms of being, unequal in perfection, but rather as two contradictory forms of being, excluding each other, so to speak. Spirit is good; matter, evil: the latter is the "*μὴ ὄν*," and therefore cannot be the work of God who is preëminently a spirit. So, the demiurge is necessarily distinct from God: man and the world have been created by a subordinate being. From this view it was easy to pass to another, viz., to consider the demiurge as an evil being; and this many Gnostics actually did.

Now, as the Bible tells us, this demiurge is the God of the Jews, the author of the Mosaic Law. Therefore, this God is a mischievous genius, and should be resisted; His law is like Him and should he despised. This conclusion, which is drawn more or less explicitly by several sects, rests moreover on

[1] St. Irenæus, *Adv. haeres.*, I, 2, 6.

[2] *Ptolem. ad Flor. Epist.*, *P. G.*, VII, 1289.

the confused ideas of the Gnosis in regard to the exclusive and narrow character of Judaism, and the opposition between Hellenism, Philosophy and the Old Testament. The latter represents only a particular and relative religion; Gnosticism dreams of a definitive and absolute religion. Such a conclusion does away with the unity of history; if creation and the Law are evil, Redemption does not come to perfect the first, but to destroy it, nor does Christianity continue the second, but stands directly against it. That there is an opposition between the Old and the New Testament is an affirmation of Marcionitism, but which is found elsewhere too.

Still, not everything in creation is evil. Without the demiurge's knowledge, the supreme Father or some superior spirit has let drop thereinto a spark, a ray, a perfume of the suprasensible world, of the First Being's realm. This divine element has more or less penetrated all creatures. In them it suffers from its contact with matter and from its imprisonment in the gross elements with which it is mixed, the more so that the demiurge persecutes it as foreign to his own work, and seeks to do away with it.

From the presence or absence of this spark of life in individuals results the division of mankind into categories quite distinct one from another, in which salvation is less a matter of free and personal initiative than the mere effect of an original state that cannot be got rid of. There are three classes of men: the spiritual or pneumatic, the psychic and the hylic or material: — *πνευματικοί*, *ψυχικοι*, *ὑλικοί* or *σωματικοί*.[1] In the first, the divine element is predominant: they cannot do evil: their salvation is assured. In the second class there is an equilibrium between the good and the evil elements: they can choose between doing what is right and what is wrong, saving and losing themselves. In the last class, matter and therefore vice is preponderant: they are irreparably condemned. The members of the first class are the Gnostics; of the second, the ordinary Christians; while in the third category are included the Jews and the Heathen.

---

[1] St. Irenæus, *Adv. haeres.*, I, 7, 5; Tertullian, *Adv. Valentinianos*, 29. Some sects, v. g., that of Saturninus, admitted only two classes.

It is easy to see in what the original fall consists, namely in the imprisonment within matter, of the spark of light and life. Hence the chief purpose of Redemption is to free this divine element and bring it back to the source from which it came; and to accomplish this, the Saviour has been sent.

As regards the person of Jesus Christ, the Gnostic systems set forth three different conceptions, two of which, however, do not exclude each other, nay are sometimes met with in the same authors.

Carpocrates and Justin the Gnostic regard the Saviour as a mere man, superior to others only in justice and sanctity. Their view, however, is an exception, for dualism is generally found in Gnostic Christology, and is even its characteristic.[1] The Saviour is made up of two beings, one earthly and human, the other heavenly and divine, that is accidentally united to the first, in order to do the work of Redemption with it and, as it were, under its cover. This is the teaching of the Valentinian school in general.

To this dualism Docetism was often added. Of the two elements that constitute Jesus Christ, the human element is only apparent. This view is but a consequence of the opposition between spirit and matter, and of the essentially evil character of the latter. Since matter is evil in itself and incapable of being saved, it cannot become an integral part of the Saviour's being, nor coöperate with His work. The heavenly Christ assumed only the appearance of matter, and even this He sur-rendered, when He ascended to the place whence He had come. Often this Docetism is absolute as in Simon, Saturninus and the Basilidians referred to by St. Irenæus; at other times, it is but partial and denies only the earthly origin of the body of Jesus, which, accordingly, was not taken from common matter, but came down from heaven and merely passed through Mary, *διὰ Μαρίας*. This is the system of Marinus and Apelles.

---

[1] Harnack (*Lehrb. der D G.*, I, p. 247, note 1; *Hist. of Dogma*, I, p. 258, note 1) aptly remarks that the distinctive feature of Gnostic Christology is not Docetism, as is commonly believed, but dualism, that is, the well-marked distinction between two natures, or rather between two persons in Jesus Christ.

As understood by the Gnostics, the Saviour had the less need of a real body, in as much as, according to them, Redemption is wrought not through His sufferings and death, but through science, through gnosis. To know the Father, till that time unknown, to penetrate into the mysteries of the sect, to believe in its secret traditions, to interpret as it does the Gospel narratives and the phenomena of nature, to partake of its rites: such is the salvation brought to us by Jesus.[1] The Gnostics are intellectualists in the bad sense of the term: science, or at least that which they dignify with this name, is for them the equivalent of virtue, nay excels it: the kingdom of heaven is reached through knowledge, not through the effort of the will.

Grounded on the speculative views we have just summed up, the Ethics of Gnosticism set forth two tendencies quite different. As early as the second century, Clement of Alexandria had divided the Gnostic sects into ascetical and licentious,[2] both starting from the intrinsically evil character, as they considered it, of matter: for, from this principle the former concluded that matter should be ill-treated; the latter, that it should be defiled, and that, as it was incapable of any good, its actions were indifferent. The irresistible determinism openly professed by some doctors could not but favor this last error: hence several schools, whose early teachers had led an austere or at least a decent life, gradually fell into revolting immorality. True, the historians of heresies may have sometimes blamed them unduly, and what they say is not always confirmed by the Gnostic fragments that have come down to us. However, these fragments are sometimes blameworthy in this regard, and then it should be borne in mind that scandalous excesses of that nature are not apt to be freely displayed in books or revealed to the public in writing.

---

[1] St. Irenæus, *Adv. haeres.*, I, 15, 2; *Philosophoumena*, V, 10; *Pistis sophia*, pp. 1, ff., 182, 232; *Book of Jeü*, p. 142.

[2] *Strom.*, III, 5, *P. G.*, VIII, 1144.

As regards eschatology, it is one of the points on which Gnosis departed most widely from orthodox Christianity. The resurrection of the body, of course, was out of the question.[1] The judgment had been already passed for many men and was being carried out day by day. On the other hand, Christ had definitively and forever ascended to the supreme Father; hence no parousia was to be expected. There would be no final crisis; rather, it would seem, the world was to come to an end through exhaustion — the Demiurge being unable to feed its life — and through the gradual withdrawal of the particles of superior light diffused throughout creation. According to Valentinus, a universal fire was to come at the appointed time and consume the material universe together with the *ὑλικοί* or grossly materialistic who are incapable of salvation.

A few words remain to be said about the Gnostic worship. Since Gnosis had issued, partly at least, from the religions of the East, and was not far removed in its esoteric teaching from the mysteries of Paganism, its worship could but be stamped with the traces of that twofold relationship. As a matter of fact, we find in it a whole system of initiations, sacraments, purifications, magical formulas, combinations of numbers, astrological divinations, amulets and charms, which sometimes indeed recall what is most holy in Christianity, but most often originate from the grossest superstition, or even embody the most revolting brutality.

---

[1] Cf. the rule of faith of Apelles in St. Epiphanius, *Haeres.* XLIV, 2.

With several of these rites and practices we are acquainted. St. Irenæus tells us of the spiritual marriage, of baptisms accompanied with Hebrew formulas, of the anointing of the dying with balm mingled with oil and water, of the mark imprinted with red-hot iron behind the right ear, of prophecies and of fictitious miracles tending to make sensible the change wrought in the Holy Mysteries.[1] Elsewhere we meet with mystical songs and hymns,[2] with the threefold baptism by fire, water and the Spirit; with a revolting eucharist,[3] strange invocations, and the use of peculiar images, symbolical drawings, medals, and stones stamped with fantastic figures. All these means and adjuncts which were often the imagination of second-rate doctors, awed the common people and made them feel the presence of the divine. Unable to understand the complex theories of Ptolemy and Basilides, they clung the more firmly to these practices, in which they believed they found the salvation and the forgiveness of sins, which these high doctrines were thought to impart.

Thus understood, Gnosis became for the Church the source of a serious danger. As we have said, several of its leaders were gifted with an uncommon penetration of mind, capable of broad views and generalizations, and gifted with eloquence; moreover, they set forth in their lives a correctness of morals, nay a Christian austerity which served to increase their authority. To the Church these men proffered precisely what she was still lacking: viz., a general view of the history and work of salvation, a philosophy of Christianity and of its relations with Judaism and Paganism, a deeper understanding of her faith. And yet, while pretending to illustrate this faith, Gnosis was actually doing away with it. On almost all the fundamental points, as the identity of God and the Demiurge, the connection of both Testaments, the universality of Redemption, the unity of person in Jesus Christ, and the real and bodily character of His manifestation, the value of His sacrifice, the resurrection of the body, and the end of man, even the nature of the Decalogue, on all these points, Gnosticism was in contradiction with the Gospel; it destroyed its simplicity and adulterated its teaching, by means of sophistry. As it has been said, it was nothing else than the "acute [refined] secularizing of Christianity,"[1] a Philosophy substituted for Revelation, an attempt made by Paganism to continue its life under the cover of the Church. And yet, this strange mixture skilfully presented to minds at the same time inquisitive and not strongly enough established, could not fail to have many attractions for them. That such was actually the case, is proved by the vogue which Gnosticism obtained, by the intellectual efforts which controversialists had to make to bring about its defeat, and finally by the care which the Church took to do away, as much as possible, with its memory and literature.

---

[1] *Adv. haeres.*, I, 13, 2, 3; 21, 3, 5; 25, 6; cf. EUSEB., *H. E.*, IV, 7, 7.

[2] *Philosophoumena*, V, 10.

[3] *Pistis Sophia*, pp. 375, ff., 386; *Book of Jeü*, pp. 194, 195, 198; ST. EPIPHANIUS, *Haeres.* XXVI, 4.

The struggle against Gnosis, in fact, was the chief doctrinal task of the Church during the second century. Now it is worthy of note, rightly observes Mgr. Duchesne,[2] that to the learned reasonings and fancies of the Gnostics, the Church did not oppose a ready-made system, a rational synthesis of her faith, a theology strictly so called — this did not exist yet: she opposed her tradition, and not precisely and directly her doctrinal tradition, but her hierarchical tradition. The successors of the Apostles alone are qualified to teach us the truth: to them we go to become acquainted with it. And since the Church of

---

[1] Harnack, *Lehrb. der D G.*, I, p. 211; *Hist. of Dogma*, I, p. 222.

[2] *Origines Chrétiennes*, pp. 168, 169.

Rome is the principal Church with which all others must agree, her tradition suffices to convict of error all those who do not think in harmony with her and do not come from her. Such was the very simple argument, more practical than theoretical, which St. Irenæus urged against Gnosis, and from his time, this argument was strong enough to win the battle. Without any sudden and violent commotion, without councils, without any solemn condemnation such as, in the following ages, routed error in a single day, "the Church rid herself of Gnosis, gradually, without any crisis, simply, by the healthy life of the body which is sufficient in itself to destroy the germs of disease, before the vital organs are attacked."

We may add, moreover, that if Gnosis was for the Church a source of serious danger, nevertheless, in other ways, it was of great profit to her. Not only did the defenders of orthodoxy, while struggling against their adversaries, learn from them more than one truth, and widen their own views, but the controversy also brought into current use a certain number of terms, such as *οὐσία*, *ὁμοούσιος*, *ὑπόστασις*, *προβολή*, etc., by which Theology profited and the exact meaning of which she had to determine. In these doctrinal debates her language began to be formed, and for the first time the need was felt to impart to it more firmness and precision.

§ 5. — Marcionitism.[1]

Marcion was formerly looked upon as one of the Gnostics, — a view which is open to criticism, since he was not prompted in his researches by those speculative preoccupations which moved the Gnostics; his system presents none of the speculations and fancies to be found in their system, and if between them there are some seeming analogies, this is probably due, not to Marcion himself, but to the Syrian Cerdon whom he knew at Rome and who was his teacher for a while (about 138–139).[1] Hence we speak of him separately.

---

[1] Sources: St. Justin, *Apology* I, 26, 58; *Dialog.*, 35; St. Irenæus, *Adv. haer.*, I, 27, 2–4; III, 4, 3; 11, 9; 12, 12; 13; 14. Tertullian, *Adv. Marcionem Libri quinque*; *De Carne Christi*; *Adv. Hermogenem*. Pseudo-Tertullian, 17. Philastrius, 45. St. Epiphanius, *Haer.* XLII. *Philosophoumena*, VII, 29–31, X, 19. Adamantius, *De recta in Deum fide*, I, II. Eznig of Goghp, *Réfutation des Sectes* (5th century). — Works: Duchesne: *Origines Chrétiennes*, chap. XI,

Marcion was struck chiefly with the opposition between the two Covenants, between the Law and the Gospel.[2] New wine, he used to say, is not put into old bottles, nor a piece of raw cloth added to an old garment.[3] But then, how can we account for the fact that the Church and her writers since the Apostles, and even the Apostles themselves, have insisted on connecting the New Covenant with the Old, grace with the Law, Christianity with Judaism? Marcion sees only one explanation: viz., all have fallen into error, St. Paul excepted. For St. Paul alone has pointed out in his Epistle to the Galatians those Judaizing doctors who pervert the Gospel by endeavoring to mix the Law with it; thus he was the man raised by God to restate the true meaning of Christianity, that had been falsified by the Twelve. Even in his case, his writings have been tampered with since his death, and must be purged of the errors that have been introduced into them.[4]

For what is the ancient Law? A just law, no doubt, but only just, and besides, severe, hard, unbending. On the con-

---

6; *Hist. anc. de l'Eglise*, vol. I, ch. XI [English transl.]. HILGENFELD, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums*, Leipsic, 1884. HARNACK, *De Apellis Gnosi monarchica*, Leipsic, 1874. MEYBOOM, *Marcion en de Marcionieten*, Leyden, 1888.

[1] About Cerdon, cf. ST. IRENÆUS, *Adv. haer.*, I, 27, 1; III, 4, 3; PSEUDO-TERTULLIAN, 16; PHILASTRIUS, 44; ST. EPIPHANIUS, *Haer.* XLI: these last three are not so reliable.

[2] *Separatio legis et evangelii proprium et principale opus est Marcionis* (TERTULL., *Adv. Marcionem*, I, 19).

[3] ST. EPIPHAN., *Haeres.* XLII, 2.

[4] ST. IREN., *Adv. haer.*, I, 27, 2; III, 2, 2; TERTULL., *Adv. Marcion.*, I, 20; IV, 3.

trary, the Gospel is nothing but kindness, love, liberty. Two such opposite dispensations cannot have the same author, and accordingly, with the help of Gnosis, Marcion holds there are two principles, two gods: — one, the Creator of the world and the Law — giver of the Old Covenant, not indeed evil in himself, but rigorous, fickle, acting only with justice and power, from whom all the sufferings of mankind originate; the other, superior to the first, revealed by Jesus, good, merciful, full of loving kindness.[1] Though the world was no concern of His, since He had not made it, still, in His mercy, He has vouchsafed to come to its rescue.[2]

It is in and through Jesus Christ that the supreme God manifests Himself. Jesus is the saving Spirit (*Spiritus salutaris*).[3] What His precise relation to God is, Marcion does not state with distinctness: though, ordinarily, he identifies God and Jesus.[4] In any case, Jesus does not realize at all the Messianic features described by the Old Covenant; He has nothing in common with the warrior announced beforehand, who was to set up the kingdom of the just God.[5] Moreover His body was only apparent: He borrowed nothing from the Demiurge's work (in this Marcion's doctrine is strict Docetism;)[6] He even did not pass through Mary as a channel; suddenly, in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, seemingly without having been born or passed through a period of growth, Christ appeared in Judæa.[7] At every step His preaching opposed the Law, the Prophets, the whole economy of the Demiurge.[8] Hence the latter's wrath, as well as his followers', against Him. Jesus is taken and crucified. Strangely enough, Marcion, who taught Docetism, ascribes to the death of Jesus — probably on St. Paul's authority — a special meaning and value in regard to our Redemption. The good God purchases us from the Demiurge.[1] Then the Saviour descends to Hades, there to preach the Gospel and announce salvation. But the just of the Old Law, Abel, Henoch, Noe, etc., thinking He is sent by the Demiurge who so often tempted them, do not answer His call. The wicked alone, Cain, the Sodomites, the Egyptians listen to His words and with Him go out from Hell.[2]

---

[1] St. Iren., *Adv. haer.*, I, 27, 2; Tertull., *Adv. Marc.*, I, 6; II, 20–26, etc.; Adamantius, I, 10–20.

[2] Tertull., *Adv. Marc.*, I, 11.

[3] *Ibid.*, I, 19.

[4] *Ibid.*, I, 11, 14; II, 27; III, 9; IV, 7.

[5] *Ibid.*, III, 12–23.

[6] *Ibid.*, III, 8–11.

[7] St. Iren., *Adv. haer.*, I, 27, 2; Tertull., *Adv. Marc.*, I, 19; IV, 6.

[8] St. Iren., *Adv. haer.*, I, 27, 2; Tertull., *Adv. Marc.*, IV, 25–27; Adamantius, I, 10–20.

The preaching of Jesus Christ was to be continued upon earth by the Apostles; but, as was said, they did not understand it; St. Paul alone was its true exponent. By assenting to it, we are justified and made children of God;[3] though besides, in practice, a severe moral life is to be added. Marcion himself gave the example of austerity (*sanctissimus magister*),[4] and imposed on his disciples a rigorous asceticism, the abstaining from pleasures, the mortification of the flesh, the privation of some kinds of food, and above all continence and celibacy. They were to live *συνταλαίπωροι καὶ συμμισούμενοι*, *commiserones et coodibiles* in the world and suffer martyrdom with courage, if it was necessary.[5] On this condition alone, would they escape the Demiurge's fire which, at the end of ages, shall consume those who are lost — and these are the majority of mankind.[6] By this teaching Marcion destroyed many features of Christian eschatology: the resurrection of the body, the parousia, the last judgment were suppressed. The merciful God, strictly speaking, would not punish the wicked: He would simply cast them aside, and by the very fact, they would fall back again into the power of the Demiurge who was to punish them.[1]

---

[1] Tertull., *Adv. Marc.*, V.

[2] St. Irenæus, *Adv. haer.*, I, 27, 3.

[3] Adamantius, II, 2, 6.

[4] Tertull., *De praescript.*, 30.

[5] Tertull., *Adv. Marc.*, I, 14, 19, 28; IV, 9, 11, etc., 36; *Philosophoumena*, VII, 29.

[6] Tertull., *Adv. Marc.*, I, 24, 28.

Such was Marcion's teaching. As we have seen, it was accompanied with a bold criticism both of primitive Christian history, and of Apostolic writings. Marcion set aside the allegorical method of exegesis, and likewise by this very fact, all the Old Testament, whose economy could, in his eyes, be justified only by this method. In the New Testament, he kept only St. Luke's Gospel — from which he excluded, however, the Saviour's genealogy and many other passages,[2] — and ten Epistles of St. Paul (the Pastoral Epistles and that to the Hebrews being left aside), in which also all that seemed to him interpolations of a later age were suppressed. Finally, he himself composed a work entitled *Antitheses*,[3] in which he had set off the manifold opposition between the Law and the Gospel, Nature and Grace, the just God and the merciful God: — a work which, together with the Epistles of St. Paul and the mutilated Gospel of St. Luke, made up the authoritative books, the canon of Marcionitism.

Thus scantily equipped, this system spread rapidly and made many recruits.[4] The very severity of its ethical code led many to embrace it, for the right measure in this line had not yet been distinctly defined. Moreover, Marcion possessed an organizing and practical mind: driven from the Church, he himself founded openly independent churches, with a hierarchy copied from that of the orthodox communities.[1] They had their martyrs,[2] and resisted, with an uncommon energy, the missionary efforts of Catholics as well as the violence of persecutors.[3] Some of these churches seem to have lasted as late as the tenth century.

---

[1] St. Iren., *Adv. haer.*, I, 27, 3; Tertull., *Adv. Marc.*, I, 27; Adamantius, II, 4–6.

[2] St. Iren., *Adv. haer.*, I, 27, 2; Tertull., *Adv. Marc.*, IV, 2, 3, 4. Marcion called it simply εὐαγγέλιον κυρίου: it was called also the *Gospel of Marcion*. The best restitution of it, as well as of his *Apostolicum*, is that by Zahn, *Geschichte des Neutes. Kanons*, II, 2, pp. 409–529; cf. I, 2, pp. 585–718.

[3] Ἀντιθέσεις: Tertull., *Adv. Marc.*, I, 19; II, 28, 29; IV, 1, 4, 6; *Philosoph.*, VII, 30. An attempt at its restitution has been made by A. Hahn, *Antitheses Marcionis Gnostici*, Königsberg, 1823.

[4] St. Justin, *Apolog.* I, 26, 58.

Doctrinal divisions soon began to arise among Marcion's disciples, chiefly in regard to the number of first principles, without, however, decreasing considerably the power of action of the heresy itself. We know some of his disciples: Potitus, Basiliscus and Syneros, mentioned by Rhodon;[4] Prepon, who, like Syneros, admitted three principles of things, a good, a bad and a just one, holding the middle between the other two;[5] Hermogenes, who was refuted by Theophilus of Antioch and Tertullian; Lucanus, who, according to the latter, also taught the resurrection of a third element, which was neither the body, nor the soul;[6] the author of the book of Leucius Charinus, an absolute Docetist;[7] others too recorded by the *Philosophoumena* (X, 19), who claimed there were four first principles, ἀγαθόν, δίκαιον, πονηρόν, ὕλη. To these were added by Theodoret, Pitho and Blastus (this last erroneously, it seems);[8] by St. Epiphanius, Theodotion,[9] and by St. Jerome, a certain Ambrose[10] who later on became the friend of Origen. But the most illustrious of all and the one who truly succeeded Marcion was Apelles.

---

[1] TERTULL., *Adv. Marc.*, IV, 5; *De Praescript.*, 41.

[2] EUSEB., *H. E.*, IV, 15, 4, 6; V, 16, 21; VII, 12; *De martyr. Palaest.*, X, 2.

[3] EUSEB., *Vita Const.*, III, 64; THEODORET, *Epist.* CXIII, CXLV.

[4] EUSEB., *H. E.*, V, 13, 3-4.

[5] *Philosophoumena*, VII, 31 (ed. Cruice, p. 382).

[6] TERTULL., *De resurrectione carnis*, 2.

[7] PHOTIUS, *Biblioth.*, cod 114; cf. *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, I, p. 870; III, p. 703.

[8] *Haereticarum fabularum compendium*, I, 25.

[9] *De mensuris et ponderibus*, 17.

[10] *De viris illustribus*, 56.

His history is given by Tertullian.[1] We are told that when, on his return from Alexandria, he had met at Rome a virgin named Philomena, who pretended to be inspired, the latter dictated to him her *Revelations* (φανερώσεις);[2] and moreover, that he himself composed Syllogisms (συλλογισμοί); fragments of which have been preserved to us by St. Ambrose.[3]

The chief change made by Apelles in his master's teaching was to bring it from Dualism to Monism. He taught there was only one first principle, which, however, is not the creator of this world.[4] The creator is an Angel of fire, who also originates from the supreme God: He is the God of Israel and our own.[5] He has created the bodies only; but to these bodies he has joined preëxisting souls. Souls have a sex of their own which they impart to bodies.[6] The rest of the system reproduced substantially that of Marcion: Docetism was somewhat mitigated;[7] but the denial of the resurrection of the body and the prohibition of marriage were maintained,[8] the Law and prophecies set aside as the work of a wicked spirit.[9] Moreover, as to doctrine itself, Apelles does not seem to have been very exacting: for him, trust in the crucified Lord and practice of virtue were, after all, the essential.[10] In this opposition to Gnostic intellectualism, he remained a true disciple of Marcion.

---

[1] *De Praescript.*, 30; *De Carne Christi*, 6.

[2] Tertull. *De Praescript.*, 30, 6; *Philosophoumena*, X, 20; Rhodon, in Euseb., *H. E.*, V, 13, 2.

[3] Pseudo-Tertull., 19; St. Ambrose, *De paradiso*, V, VI, VII, etc.

[4] Rhodon in Euseb., *H. E.*, V, 13, 2, 6; Tertull., *De Praescript.*, 34. — The *Philosophoumena* (X 20) presents on this subject confusions that can be easily accounted for by what we say in the text.

[5] Tertull., *De Praescript.*, 34; *De Anima*, 23.

[6] Tertull., *De resurrectione carnis*, 5; *De anima*, 23, 36.

[7] Tertull., *Adv. Marc.*, III, 11; *De carne Christi*, 1, 6; *Philosoph.*, X, 20; Pseudo-Tertull., 19.

[8] Tertull., *De Praescript.*, 33; Pseudo-Tertull., 19.

[9] Rhodon, in Euseb., *H. E.*, V, 13, 2, 9.

[10] Rhodon, in Euseb., *H. E.*, V, 13, 5.

§ 6. — Tatian and the Encratites.[1]

In connection with Marcionitism, we must speak of Tatian and the Encratites. Though St. Irenæus treats of Tatian in reference to the Encratites and adds that he taught a doctrine of a special character (*ἴδιον χαρακτῆρα διδασκαλείου συνεστήσατο*), yet he does not state explicitly that Tatian founded the sect; he accuses him only of having denied Adam's salvation, condemned marriage as a fornication, and held, like Valentinus, successions of eons. Clement of Alexandria speaks also of his repudiation of marriage, and mentions his work — now lost — *Περὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὸν σωτῆρα καταρτισμοῦ.* The historians of heresies, who came after, have substantially reproduced the information given by St. Irenæus; and hence it is quite possible that Eusebius (*H. E.*, IV, 28) and St. Epiphanius (*Haer.* XLVI, 1) have given to it more precision than they had a right to, when they have affirmed that Tatian was considered or even was actually the founder of the Encratites; the more so that St. Irenæus, in the very same place, connects the Encratites with Saturninus and Marcion.

As a matter of fact, it is more probable that the heretics known under the name of Encratites or Continents never formed a separate and independent sect. That name, it seems, was given to all those Christians in general whose austerity was based, not merely on the desire of leading a more perfect life, but also on theories as to the more or less essentially evil character of matter, as being the work of an imperfect or wicked God. Clement of Alexandria quotes, in his Stromata (III, 13, 14), several passages of a book of Julius Cassianus,

---

[1] Sources: St. Iren., *Adv. haer.*, I, 28, 1. Clement of Alex., *Stromata*, III, 13. *Philosophoumena*, VIII, 16, 20; X, 18. Pseudo-Tertull., 20. Philastrius, 48, 72, 84. St. Epiphanius, *Haer.* XLVI, XLVII. Eusebius, *H. E.*, IV, 28, 29. — Works: M. Ledermann, *Examen des hérésies de Tatien*, Strasburg, 1845. Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums*, Leipsic, 1884.

Περὶ ἐγκρατείας, ἢ περὶ εὐνουχίας, that forbade marriage absolutely. St. Irenæus, who, as we have said, points out Saturninus and Marcion as the founders of the Encratite sect, accuses them of teaching Adam's damnation and the abstaining from marriage and from the flesh of animals. The *Philosophoumena* (VIII, 20) adds that, as regards God and Jesus Christ, they were in agreement with the Church: which evidently shows that, for many of them, it was merely a practical question. Philastrius (72), while he names Aerius as their leader, characterizes their doctrine in the same manner. As to the Abstinents of whom he speaks in the 84th chapter, they must evidently be placed side by side with the Encratites whose erroneous views they share. After reproducing the historical notice of St. Irenæus, Eusebius mentions a sect of Severians, who had originated from a certain Severus: whom he believes to have still further developed Tatian's heresy (*H. E.*, IV, 29, 4, 5). Yet, to judge from the details which the Bishop of Cæsarea himself records, these heretics should be associated rather with the Judæo-Christians. On the other hand, the description left by St. Epiphanius (*Haer.* XLVII, 1) suggests that the Encratites, of whom he speaks, had united with the remnant of Gnostics and Manicheans.

Thus, while some minds, attracted by the speculative questions of God's nature and of the origin of the world and of evil, plunged themselves into the dreams of Gnosis, others, setting themselves to the problem of man's salvation, looked for its solution exclusively in the character of the moral life: but they also fell into manifest exaggerations. According to them, it is not knowledge that saves us: Marcion and the Encratites assigned to it the second rank and Apelles did not care about orthodoxy: salvation comes from works, and the most difficult works are regarded as obligatory. Against this last assertion, the Church had to determine what was legitimate austerity, and where austerity passed into forbidden Encratism. In the letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne about the Martyrs of the year 177, we see one of the confessors of the faith, Alcibiades, who used to take only bread and water, called to task by Attalus after a revelation, and submitting himself to the latter's warnings.[1]

§ 7. — Montanism.[2] The Alogi.

Montanism differs from Judæo-Christianity and from Gnosis, in as much as it was not, like them, the result of an effort made by Philosophy and outside Religions to keep Christianity within the framework of the Old Testament or to transform her more or less into themselves: it was a *domestic* struggle of elements that were *within* the Church: hence it is a heresy, properly socalled. In the Gnostic crisis, the problem was to know which was to guide the faith and rule the conduct of Christians, whether it would be speculation represented by Gnosis and its doctors, or the traditional teaching represented by the ecclesiastical catechesis and the bishops. In the Montanistic crisis, the problem is to know first whether the economy of grace brought in by Jesus and received by the Apostles is the ultimate and definitive economy, or whether there is not to be another and more perfect economy, due to the special outpouring of the Holy Ghost on new Prophets. Consequently it had to be determined whether the successors of the Apostles, the bishops, remained authoritatively charged with the doctrinal and moral leadership of the Church, or whether, on the other hand, there were prophets alongside of them or above them and directly inspired by God, to whom this leadership was entrusted. In its first conflict, the doctrinal and hierarchical authority of the Church had to defend itself against the pretensions of speculation: now, it has to defend itself against the claims of private inspiration.

---

[1] Euseb., *H. E.*, V, 3, 2, 3.

[2] Sources: The oldest are the documents mentioned or quoted by Eusebius. He *mentions:* The letters of the Martyrs of Lyons in the year 177 to the churches of Asia and Phrygia and to Pope Eleutherus, and the letter in which the Christians of Gaul expressed their views on the Montanistic question (*H. E.*, V, 3, 4). A work of Apollinaris of Hierapolis (*H. E.*, V, 19, 1; 16, 1). A work of Miltiades Περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν προφήτην ἐν ἐκστάσει λαλεῖν (*H. E.*, V, 17). He *quotes* the following: A letter of Serapion of Antioch (about 200) to Caricus and Ponticus (*H. E.*, V, 19). A work of Apollonius of Ephesus (*H. E.*, V, 18). An anonymous work addressed to Abercius Marcellus and composed about 211 (*H. E.*, V, 16). — Then, Tertullian, *De corona militis*; *De fuga in persecutione; De exhortatione castitatis*; *De virginibus velandis*; *De monogamia*; *De ieiunio adversus psychicos*; *De pudicitia*. His seven books *De exstasi* are lost (cf. St. Jerome, *De viris illustr.*, 24, 40, 53). Pseudo-Tertullian, 21. Philastrius, 49. St. Epiphanius, who on this topic is well informed and has drawn from an ancient source, apparently the work of Miltiades, *Haer.* XLVIII, XLIX. The *Philosophoumena*, VIII, 19; X, 25. Origen, *In Epistolam ad Titum* (Edit. Lommatzsch, V, 291). Didymus, *De Trinitate*, III, 41. St. Jerome, *Epist.* XLI. Theodoret, *Haeretic. fabul. Compendium*, III, 2. — Modern Works: Duchesne, *Origines Chrétiennes*, chap. XV; *Hist. anc. de l'Eglise*, vol. I, pp. 270, ff. Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums*, Leipsic, 1884, pp. 560–601. G. N. Bonwetsch, *Die Geschichte des Montanismus*, Erlangen, 1881. W. Belck, *Geschichte des Montanismus, sein Entstehungsursachen*, Leipsic, 1883. V. Ermoni, *La crise montaniste*, in the *Revue des questions Historiques*, vol. LXXII, 1902, pp. 61–96. [Duchesne's *Histoire* has been translated into English.]

The beginnings of Montanism are comparatively well known, though there is still some uncertainty as to the precise time when it originated. It was probably about the year 172, that a recent convert, Montanus, from the borough of Ardabau, in Phrygian Mysia, began to experience raptures and ecstasies, and to utter speeches which caused him to be considered by some as possessed by the Evil Spirit, and by others as inspired. Two women, Priscilla and Maximilla, who became his followers, soon exhibited the same strange disorders. The commotion gradually spread through Phrygia (*ἡ κατὰ Φρύγας αἵρεσις*). Crowds flock to the plain lying between Pepuza and Tymion, where the heavenly Jerusalem is presently to descend. There meetings are held and the Holy Mysteries celebrated in the open air: extraordinary phenomena are witnessed. Some go into ecstasy, others are lifted by some strange force from the ground. As the end of the world is near at hand, everybody sells his property or surrenders it for the needs of the brethren. The enthusiasm is at its highest pitch.

What, then, was the doctrine that brought about this enthusiasm? At bottom, and chiefly in its early days, Montanism was a religious movement, a kind of spiritual *revival* gone to extremes, rather than a definite system. In it a larger room was made for ethics than for speculation. Nevertheless, the new prophet Montanus and his followers pretended to be in the hands of the Holy Ghost what the lyre is in those of the musician: the human instrument was asleep, as it were, but the Spirit was watching: God Himself spoke in His own name; the prophet simply resigned himself to be the organ of God. This inspiration was the outpouring of the Paraclete, announced by the Saviour and recorded by St. John (14^{16}, etc.). Some, distinguishing between the Paraclete and the Holy Ghost, even went so far as to affirm that the latter alone had descended on the Apostles, while the former, reserved for Montanus, taught through him a doctrine superior to that of Jesus Christ.

However, the Christian creed was not to be corrected by the new revelation. Tertullian, a Montanist, affirms emphatically, on the contrary, that it does but strengthen it, while, at the same time, it puts an end to some indulgences which Jesus Christ had thought it wise not to suppress.[1] Thus, the Montanists forbade a second marriage, and perhaps at the beginning even a first marriage: additional festival days and more frequent fasts were introduced. Besides Lent, two periods were observed, during which only dry food and roots were used at meals. But the chief tenet, the one that imparted to all the others their meaning and value, was the belief in the nearness of the parousia and of the millennium. Christ was soon to come down and rule over His people; they should get ready for this event by a universal detachment.

---

[1] TERTULLIAN, *De monogamia*, 2, 3, 14. *De Virgin. vel.*, 1. *Regnavit duritia cordis usque ad Christum; regnaverit infirmitas carnis usque ad Paracletum. Nova lex abstulit repudium* (*habuit quod auferret*), *nova prophetia secundum matrimonium, non minus repudium prioris* (*De monog.*, 14).

Imbued with this conviction and most active in their proselytizing, the Montanists made rapid progress and soon spread their errors in the province of Asia, in Galatia and chiefly in Phrygia, where attempts were made to assign them to special districts and thus to restrict their expansion. Among those who distinguished themselves in the early stage of the sect may be mentioned a certain Alcibiades, who seems to have presided over it after Montanus; a so called confessor of the faith, Themison, who composed a blasphemous epistle against the Lord and the genuine Apostles; a thief, Alexander, whose official record was still kept at Ephesus, and finally a certain Theodotus, a believer, but a simple man, who met death, it is said, in attempting the feat of rising in the air. So, the Cataphrygian community was made up of elements of a very mixed character. At Rome, about 200–207, we find the Montanists established and presided over by Proclus[1] and Æschines. Division soon broke out among them, on occasion of the Monarchian controversy, and then there were Montanists *kata Proclum* and Montanists *kata Æschinem.* But at this very time (about 202), the sect made a most important conquest in the person of Tertullian.[2] Under his influence, it became organized in Africa, and the rather strange scenes that had occurred in Phrygia took place again in the new communities: an interesting scene is described by Tertullian in his treatise *De Anima* (9).

However, the Church did not lose courage and strove immediately to repel the attack and destroy the error. In the East, holy bishops sought to bring back the wandering, and vigorous apologists put forth refutations of the heresy. Eusebius knew and sometimes quotes the works of Apollinaris of Hierapolis, Miltiades, Serapion of Antioch, Apollonius and finally of an anonymous author who wrote about thirteen years after Maximilla's death, viz., about the year 211, and some fragments of whom he has preserved. At the same time several councils of the bishops of Phrygia and the neighborhood were convened. One was held at Iconium, in which it was decided to renew the baptism of the Montanists who would embrace the true faith,[1] and another at Synnada,[2] both between the years 230 and 235.

---

[1] Euseb., *H. E.*, II, 25, 6, 7; III, 28, 2; 31, 4; cf. VI, 20, 3. He is probably the same as the Proculus of Tertullian (*Adv. Valentinianos*, 5).

[2] The redactor of the *Passio SS. Perpetuae et Felicitatis* was also certainly under the influence of the new prophecies. We could not say exactly when. From this, however, we should not infer that the Martyrs themselves were Montanists.

In the West, the earliest writings relating to Montanism, which we know, are the letters sent by the Confessors of Lyons in the year 177 to the brethren of Asia and to Pope Eleutherus, *τῆς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν εἰρήνης ἕνεκεν*, "for the peace of the churches," says Eusebius. This expression has led some scholars — among them, many Protestants[3] — to believe that the authors of these letters were in sympathy with the Montanists. The contrary is certain: for Eusebius adds that these documents were published by the Christians of Gaul, when the latter set forth their judgment in the matter, a judgment "pious and most orthodox, (*εὐσεβῆ καὶ ὀρθοδοξοτάτην*)." Now, how could they have made public writings that would have contradicted their own sentiments? The words *εἰρήνης ἕνεκεν*, then, have not the meaning and bearing ascribed to them. As to Eleutherus, though the question was brought before him, he, as well as his successor, Victor, does not seem to have solved it in a definitive manner. This was done by

---

[1] *Epist. Firmiliani ad Cyprianum* (*Cypriani* Epist. LXXV, 7, Edit. Hartel).

[2] EUSEB., *H. E.*, VII, vii, 5.

[3] HARNACK, *Lehrb. der D G.*, I, p. 392; *Hist. of Dogma*, vol. II, p. 97.

Zephyrinus who, at first unacquainted with the true state of affairs, was duly informed by the Monarchian Praxeas, and stopped in time the letters of communion already directed to the Montanistic Churches.[1]

Although all these writings and measures did not immediately check the Montanistic movement, they at least restrained its diffusion and progress. In Africa, the sect spread little; it had nearly disappeared in the year 370, and it died away altogether during the lifetime of St. Augustine.[2] In the East, it continued to subsist for a longer time; there it had martyrs whose deeds it did not fail to record and praise.[3] The rigorous measures of Constantine and of Theodosius could not uproot it, and Sozomen informs us that Montanists were still quite numerous in his time.[4] They do not seem to have outlived the sixth century.

Moreover, it seems that, very soon after the rise of the Montanistic sect, a reaction which fell into another extreme arose against it in Asia Minor. St. Irenæus (*Adv. Haer.*, III, 11, 9) tells us of people, who, in order not to admit the manifestations of the Holy Ghost, rejected St. John's Gospel, where this outpouring is announced. By bringing together this text and the details recorded by St. Epiphanius (*Haer.* LI) and Philastrius (60), we are led to see in these dissenters the Alogi, whose origin thus would go back to the years 170–180.[1]

---

[1] Tertullian, *Adv. Praxeam*, 1.

[2] St. Optatus, *Contra Parmenianum*, I, 9. St. Augustine, *De haeresibus*, 86.

[3] Euseb., *H. E.*, V, xvi, 20–22. In some churches attached to Montanism, a prophecy of Quintilla or of Priscilla gave rise to strange customs. The prophetess in a dream had seen Christ, under the form of a woman, descend towards her and impart wisdom to her. From this it was inferred that women could, as well as men, enter into the clergy and exercise liturgical functions. Seven virgins, clad in white garments, would appear with lighted lamps before the assembly and then, as if violently agitated by the Holy Ghost, exhort the people to do penance (St. Epiphanius, *Haeres.* XLIX, 1, 2). — In the 4th century, the Montanists were accused of sacrificing a child whose blood was drawn in the Holy Mysteries (Philastrius, 49; St. Epiphanius, *Haer.* XLVIII, 14) St. Jerome, who relates this accusation (*Epist.* XLI, 4), does not accept it as true; as a matter of fact, there is nothing to justify it.

[4] *Hist. Eccles.*, II, 32. Elsewhere (VII, 18), he remarks that one of their special customs was to celebrate Easter always on the 8th day of the Ides of April, or, if that day was not a Sunday, on the following Sunday.

What St. Epiphanius relates about them is very plain and simple.[2] They reject the Gospel and the Apocalypse of St. John, which they ascribe to Cerinthus, asserting that these books are not worthy to be received in the Church (3): hence they do not admit likewise the Logos preached by the Apostle (3, 18), and because of this, truly deserve to be styled ἄλογοι (*without reason*, 3). However, St. Epiphanius does not think that their dislike for the term λόγος leads them to deny the Son's person — on the contrary, he states that they agree generally with the Church, — nor even that their refusal to accept the fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse springs from an anti-Montanistic tendency: we draw this last conclusion chiefly from the comparison of his remarks with the passage of St. Irenæus.

On the other hand, this anti-Montanistic tendency seems quite manifest in the presbyter Caius, who, a few years later, about the year 210, rejected, not the Gospel, but the Apocalypse of St. John, and this, in a work against the Montanists.[3]

In any case, it cannot be inferred from these facts that the canonical character of the fourth Gospel was not yet acknowledged about the years 170–180. As to the Apocalypse, the case is somewhat different: it is well known that this book, which had been received in the West many years before that time, had great difficulty in winning a definitive place in the canon of the Eastern Churches.[1]

---

[1] Sources: St. Irenæus, *Adv. haer.*, III, 11, 9. Philastrius, 60. St. Epiphanius, *Haer.* LI. Euseb., *H. E.*, III, 28, 1. — Works: Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentl. Kanons*, I, 220–262. Harnack, *Das Neue Testament um das Jahr* 200, Friburg in Brisgau, 1889. Corrsen, *Monarchianische Prologe zur den vier Evangelien*, Leipsic, 1896. Rose, *Aloges asiates et romains*, in the *Revue Biblique*, vol. VI, 1897. The works on Montanism.

[2] St. Epiphanius drew his information apparently from the *Syntagma* of St. Hippolytus, and from another work, probably of the same author, directed specially against the Alogi (Harnack, *Lehrb. der D G.*, I, p. 661, note 2; *Hist. of Dogma*, vol. III, p. 15, note 1).

[3] Euseb., *H. E.*, III, 28, 1; cf. II, 25, 6.

§ 8. — Millenarianism.[2]

We may say here a few words on this error which was much spread in the second and third centuries, though it never had the character of a fixed and authorized teaching.

Millenarianism was a legacy from Judaism. The Jews, as it is well known, expected a temporal Messianic rule, the duration of which was sometimes said to be 1000 years. As Jesus had not fulfilled this expectation in His first advent, many Christians placed its fulfilment at the time of His second coming. The Son of man was to come down upon earth in a glorious state and rule for a thousand years with the just over a renewed Jerusalem; and this period would be followed by the general resurrection, the judgment and the end of all things, the everlasting happiness of the elect and the eternal loss of the wicked. It should be observed that in this opinion the retribution that follows death was only temporary, and that the definitive retribution was to take place after the last judgment.

In fact, this is very nearly what we read in the Apocalypse, and there is no doubt that Millenarianism owed its success chiefly to that book, too narrowly interpreted. Moreover, certain calculations, based on the data of the Bible, and determining the ages of the world and their consummation, helped probably in the same direction.

---

[1] Euseb., *H. E.*, III, 28, 3, ff.; VII, 25.

[2] Atzberger, *Geschichte der christlichen Eschatologie innerhalb der vornicänischen Zeit*, Friburg in Brisgau, 1896. Terry, *Biblical Apocalyptics*, New York, 1898. V. Ermoni, *Les phases successives de l'erreur millénariste*, in the *Revue des Questions historiques*, vol. LXX, 1901. Gry, *Le Millénarisme dans ses origines et son développement.* Paris, 1904.

Cerinthus is the first accused by the presbyter Caius and by Dionysius of Alexandria of having upheld Millenarianism and explained the delights of the Millennium in the grossest manner.[1] Later on, the Montanists made it the ordinary topic of their preaching.

Besides these teachers who were more or less suspect, it reckoned among its followers men of an unquestioned orthodoxy: such as Papias and the author of the Epistle of Barnabas, already mentioned; St. Justin, who quotes, to prove its existence, texts from Isaias and the Apocalypse,[2] though, on the authority of St. Luke ($20^{35, 36}$), he excludes from it sexual pleasures; St. Irenæus, who adopts it most eagerly as an argument against the Gnostics in behalf of the resurrection of the body, and very plainly accuses of heresy (*haereticos sensus in se habentes*) all those who think that the souls of the just ascend to God immediately after death.[3] Millenarianism prevailed probably chiefly in Western Asia where St. John's memory was carefully preserved. St. Irenæus was a native of that province and the Montanists dwelt not far from it. With these names we may also associate those of Methodius of Olympus,[4] Apollinaris of Laodicea.[5] The error spread as far as Egypt. In the first half of the third century, we find it maintained there by a bishop, Nepos, under its coarsest form, in a work entitled Ἔλεγχος ἀλληγοριστῶν, and by a certain Coracion, who had on his side whole dioceses.[6] As regards the rest of Africa, Tertullian's authority probably helped to spread and maintain the doctrine there. We find it fully displayed in the poems of Commodian,[1] and, at the beginning of the fourth century, in the *Divine Institutions* of Lactantius.[2] In Styria, about the same time, Victorinus, bishop of Pettau (+303), held it also, as St. Jerome relates.[3]

---

[1] Euseb., *H. E.*, III, 28, 2, 4, 5; VII, 25, 3.

[2] *Dialogue*, 80, 81.

[3] *Adv. haer.*, V, 28–36.

[4] *Symposium*, IX, 5.

[5] St. Basil, *Epist.* CCLXIII, 4.

[6] Euseb., *H. E.*, VII, 24.

However, the Millenarian opinion was far from being shared by all, and we see early and vigorous protests raised against it. St. Justin does not hesitate to own that many orthodox Christians do not admit it;[4] this is also what St. Irenæus seems to imply, for those whom he opposes *putantur recte credidisse*, he says (*Adv. haer.*, V, 31, 1). In the beginning of the third century, the presbyter Caius is, at Rome, its decided opponent,[5] and Origen[6] starts against it a campaign which his disciple, St. Dionysius of Alexandria, will carry on with spirit.[7] The great allegorist was not at a loss to explain away the texts from Scripture that might have been objected to him, nor was he slow to style slaves to the letter (*solius litterae discipuli*) and judaizers those who were moved by such passages. As to Dionysius, he went still further, and in order to deprive Nepos and Coracion of their strongest support, he did not hesitate to declare, after a bold study of the problem, that the Apocalypse could not be the work of St. John the Apostle.

Millenarianism did not outlive the fifth century. In the East the Cappadocians, disciples of Origen, turned against it the strength of their authority. In the West, St. Augustine, who, as he himself tells us, professed it for a while, undermined its foundation, by giving an orthodox explanation of the Apocalypse: for him the kingdom of Christ was nothing else than the Church upon earth.[1] The error gradually disappeared, though it was revised later, during the Middle Ages, by some sects of visionaries.

---

[1] *Carmen Apologeticum*, verses 975, ff.; *Instructiones*, II, 3, 39.

[2] *Institut. divinae*, VII, 22, 24.

[3] *De Viris illust.*, 18.

[4] Πολλοὺς δ' αὖ καὶ τῶν τῆς καθαρᾶς καὶ εὐσεβοῦς ὄντων χριστιανῶν γνώμης τοῦτο μὴ γνωρίζειν (*Dialog.*, 80).

[5] Euseb., *H. E.*, III, 28, 1, 2.

[6] *De principiis*, II, 2, foll.

[7] Euseb., *H. E.*, VIII, 24, 25.

On the whole, the Church paid but little attention to that erroneous view; nor does she seem to have seen in it a very great danger. Sprung from Judaism, Millenarianism shared the weakness and unimportance which, after the rise of Christianity, characterized all that pertained to the Synagogue of old. True, the clearness with which it seemed to be contained in the Apocalypse at first contributed to its being received or tolerated by many, and the Montanistic movement did but increase its success and the number of its adherents. But the current that drove intelligences farther and farther from Jewish conceptions, the custom of interpreting the Scriptures more freely and even in an allegorical manner, and finally the obscurity which was felt more and more to surround the Apocalypse, — all this gradually turned away the minds of Christians from Millenarianism and brought them back to a more spiritual and simple view of the orthodox eschatology.

---

[1] *De civitate Dei*, XX, 7, foll.

CHAPTER V

THE DOCTRINAL STRUGGLE AGAINST HEATHENISM — BEGINNINGS OF SPECULATIVE THEOLOGY — THE APOLOGISTS OF THE SECOND CENTURY[1]

§ 1. — General Remarks about the Apologists.

The name of Apologists has been given, from an immemorial ecclesiastical custom, to a group of writers, who in the second and even in the third century, endeavored to clear the Christians from the reproach of crimes ascribed to them under the influence of ill-will and prejudice, to obtain for them tolerance and the fair application of the laws, to show that the doctrine they professed rightly claimed the attention, the respect, and even the assent of thoughtful minds.

---

[1] The editions quoted are indicated below. Works: G. Schmitt, *Die Apologie der drei ersten Jahrhunderte in historisch-systematischer Darstellung*, Mentz, 1890. J. Zahn, *Die apologetischen Grundgedanken in der Litteratur der ersten drei Jahrhunderte systematisch dargestellt*, Würzburg, 1890. L. Duchesne, *Les Témoins Anténicéens du dogme de la Trinité*, Amiens, 1883. — About Aristides: M. Picard, *L'Apologie d'Aristide*, Paris, 1892. — About St. Justin: C. Semisch, *Justin der Martyrer*, Breslau, 1840–1842. M. von Engelhardt, *Das Christentum Justin des Martyrer*, Erlangen, 1878. A. Staehlin, *Justin der Martyrer*, Leipsic, 1880. J. Sprinzl, *Die Theologie des hl. Justinus des Martyrs*, in the *Theolog-prakt. Quartalschrift*, 1884–1886. C. Clemen, *Die religions-philosophische Bedentung des stoisch-christlichen Eudämonismus in Justins Apologie*, Leipsic, 1890. W. Flemming, *Zur Beurteilung des Christentums Justins des Martyrers*, Leipsic, 1893. On the special points of St. Justin's theology, cf. the works referred to by Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Litteratur*, I, pp. 240, ff. — About Tatian: H. A. Daniel, *Tatianus der Apologet*, Halle, 1837. W. Steuer, *Die Gottes-und Logoslehre des Tatians*, Leipsic, 1893. B. Ponschab, *Tatians Rede an die Griechen*, Metten, 1895. A. Puech, *Recherches sur le Discours aux Grecs de Tatien*, Paris, 1903. — On Athenagoras: F. Schubring, *Die Philosophie des Athenagoras*, Berlin, 1882. J. Lehmann, *Die Auferstehungslehre des Athenagoras*, Leipsic, 1890. L. Arnould, *De Apologia Athenagorae*, Paris, 1898. — About Theophilus of Antioch: L. Paul, *Der Begriff des Glaubens bei dem Apologeten Theophilus*, in the *Jahrb. f. protest. Theologie*, vol. I, 1875. O. Gross, *Weltenstehungslehre des Theophilus von Antiochia*, Leipsic, 1895. O. Gross, *Die Gotteslehre des Theophilus von Antiochia*, Chemnitz, 1896. — About the Epistle to Diognetus: J. Draeseke,

Thus understood in a restricted sense, the name of Apologists can be applied to about fifteen authors, several of whom, however, deserve only a mention, since their works are completely or almost completely lost: such as Quadratus (about 125–126), Aristo (135–165), Rhodon (before 172), Miltiades (about 150), Apollinaris of Hierapolis (160–176), Melito (175–180). The only ones we can study here are (1) Aristides, *Apology to Antoninus Pius* (136–161);[1] — (2) St. Justin: *First Apology* (150–155); *Second Apology* (150–160); *Dialogue with Trypho*, published soon after the first Apology, and probably before 161;[2] — (3) Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos*, about 165;[3] — (4) Athenagoras, *Supplicatio pro Christianis* (176–178); *De resurrectione mortuorum*[4] — (5) Theophilus of Antioch, *Ad Autolycum libri tres* (169–182);[5] — (6) The *Epistle to Diognetus*, probably in the second century;[6] — (7) Minucius Felix, *Octavius* (probably 180–end of the second century);[7] — (8) Tertullian,

Der Brief an Diognetos, Leipsic, 1881. S. BALJON, *De Brief an Diognetus*, in the *Theolog. Studien*, 1900. — About Minucius Felix: P. DE FÉLICE, *Étude sur l'Octavius de Minucius Félix*, Blois, 1880. R. KUEHN, *Der Oktavius des Minucius Felix*, Leipsic, 1882. O. GRILLNBERGER, *Studien zur Philosophie der patristischen Zeit*, I, *Der Oktavius des Minucius Felix* in the *Jahrb. f. Philos. und spekul. Theol.*, vol. III, 1889. G. BOISSIER, *La Fin du Paganisme*, I, Paris, 1891.

[1] *The Apology of Aristides on behalf of the Christians*, edit. J. RENDEL HARRIS and J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, Texts and Studies, I, 1, Cambridge, 1891.

[2] *Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum saeculi secundi*, edidit DE OTTO, vol. I, II; 3rd ed., Jena, 1886, 1887.

[3] Edit. OTTO, *op. cit.*, VI, 1st edit., 1851.

[4] Edit. OTTO, *op. cit.*, VII, 1st edit., 1857.

[5] Edit. OTTO, *op. cit.*, VIII, 1st edit., 1861.

[6] Edit. FUNK, *Patres Apostolici*, I, 1901.

[7] *P. L.*, III.

Apologeticum (probably fall of 197);[1] — (9) Hermias, *Irrisio gentilium philosophorum* (third century?);[2] — (10) Finally several works ascribed to St. Justin, though at least the first three are not truly his: Πρὸς Ἕλληνας, placed by Harnack between the years 180 and 240; Λόγος παραινετικὸς πρὸς Ἕλληνας, which, according to Bardenhewer, belongs to the same epoch; Περὶ θεοῦ μοναρχίας, perhaps of the third century, and Περὶ ἀναστάσεως (150–180), with which Tertullian and St. Irenæus were acquainted and whose authorship there is no reason to deny to St. Justin.[3]

Now, in their writings specially devoted to the defence of religion, these Apologists aim chiefly, of course, at justifying Christianity and setting it forth as a harmless doctrine, respectful of the established order and institutions,[4] and moreover in harmony with reason whose data she confirms and completes. Hence they are led to insist on her doctrines of natural religion, and on those teachings of hers which agree with the teachings of the great schools of spiritualistic philosophy: — the unity of God, the future life, the moral law and its sanction beyond the grave; or, if they speak of her mysteries, they do so to show that between these mysteries and certain beliefs of Heathenism, the distance is not so great as one might think at first sight. Thus presented, Christianity assumes the appearance of a most lofty human wisdom, of a most refined religion which, in some respects, approaches the religions then known. However, this concept alone is far from being the full expression of their minds. We know that their creed included something more. It included particularly distinctly supernatural and Christian truths, which we meet either in those of their writings destined for the faithful, or in their apologies to the Heathen and to the Jews, for even in these last works they manifest sometimes their whole faith. The Apologists are not, then, mere philosophers; they are also believers; so that to infer from their silence that they were ignorant of certain mysteries is to expose oneself to many mistakes. This silence is generally too well accounted for, to enable one to draw therefrom an argument against them.[1]

---

[1] Edit. Œhler, Leipsic, 1853, vol. I.

[2] Edit. Otto, *op. cit.*, IX, 1st edit., 1872.

[3] Edit. Otto, *op. cit.*, III, 3rd edit., 1879.

[4] Cf. the *Epistle to Diognetus*, V, 1–6.

However, to study them properly, we ought to distinguish this twofold standpoint and consider them successively both as defenders and as teachers of the faith.

§ 2. — The Apologetics of the Apologists, and their concept of Revelation.

As we have seen, the task of the Apologists as such, was twofold: they intended, on one hand, to justify Christianity and win her tolerance and respect; on the other, to show her reasonableness and increase the number of her followers.

The first point was a question of mere juridical examination and discussion. The Christians were accused of atheism and impiety; they were charged with worshipping no god and despising those of the Empire, with rebelling therefore against the authority of the laws, and were considered as guilty of high treason against the Emperor and the nation. They were accused, moreover, of infanticide and cannibalism, of banquets of Thyestes; and finally of wicked actions and of shameful incests, like that of Œdipus.[2] These calumnies could only be answered by emphatic denials and an appeal to facts. Truly, though the Christians do not worship the gods and idols of Heathenism, they are not atheists and irreligious men. They are not enemies of the Empire, who, while giving up all earthly ambition, pray for the prosperity of the State and the welfare of the Emperors, and who, absolutely loyal to their country, while striving to make men virtuous, aim by this very fact at supplying the State with its best citizens.[1] As to the crimes and shameful deeds of which they are accused, the general purity of their morals, their dislike for the sights and games of the circus suffice to clear them from such accusations: accusations which, on the other hand, might rightly be brought against the Pagans.[2]

---

[1] [On the other hand, cf. also Newman, *Development of Christian Doctrine*, pp. 27, 28 and chiefly 29. T].

[2] These are the three headings of accusations summed up by Athenagoras: Τρία ἐπιφημίζουσιν ἡμῖν ἐγκλήματα· ἀθεότητα, θυέστεια δεῖπνα, οἰδιπουδείους μίξεις (*Supplic.*, 3. Cf. Euseb., *H. E.*, V, I, 9; Tertullian, *Apologet.*, 10).

And then, these crimes have never been established: nay, they have not been even inquired into; hence it is sheer injustice, when the Christians are condemned solely because of their name and quality of Christians, before being proved guilty and allowed to use a right which is not denied to other accused persons: that of defending themselves and showing their innocence.[3]

However interesting may be this first part of the defence made by the Apologists, yet it is not the one that chiefly concerns our subject: for our purpose here is to know in what light they presented Christianity to their adversaries, and what was their idea of her relations both to Philosophy and to the other religions then in vogue.

Philosophy was, in the second century, the best, nay the only ground on which enlightened minds could meet, to whatever religion they belonged. Nevertheless, all Apologists did not observe towards it the same attitude. Though Tatian,

---

[1] St. Justin, *Apolog.* I, 6, 9, 11–13; Tatian, 4; Athenagoras, *Supplic.*, 4–10, 37; Theophilus, I, 2–7; Minucius, 32; Tertullian, 10, 11, 17, 30–32, 36.

[2] St. Justin, *Apolog.*, I, 15–17, 26, 27, 29; Tatian, 25; Athenag., *Supplic.*, 32–35; Theophilus, III, 3, 15; *Ep. to Diogn.*, V, 7–16; VI; Minucius, 28–31; Tertullian, 2, 7, 8.

[3] St. Justin, *Apol.*, I, 2; Athenag., *Supplic.*, 1, 2; Tertullian, 2, 3.

Tertullian and Hermias do not pass a wholesale condemnation on any kind of philosophy, but only on the proud science that rejects God and thinks it can solve by itself the problems of our origin and destiny, still undoubtedly they are rather unfavorable to any philosophical system and take great delight in laughing Philosophers to scorn.[1] On the contrary, the other Apologists, who themselves had been Philosophers before embracing Christianity and had remained such after, appealed more often to the authority of Philosophy and endeavored to show that the new religion agreed with it in the main. St. Justin is the one who understood and exposed this harmony on the broadest scale.

He starts with laying down as a principle that Christianity is a philosophy, the only safe and useful philosophy; and that by embracing it, one is and remains a true philosopher: Ταύτην μόνην εὕρισκον φιλοσοφίαν ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ σύμφορον. Οὕτως δὴ καὶ διὰ ταῦτα φιλόσοφος ἐγώ (*Dialog.*, 8).[2] For between the teachings of Christianity and those of the best philosophical schools there exists a similarity, nay, an identity, that cannot be denied. The differences between them are shades rather than oppositions (*Apolog.* II, 13). On several points faith affirms the very truths already professed by Plato, Menander and the Stoics: but it affirms them more fully and with a divine authority; and it not only affirms, it proves them also.[3]

How is this similarity to be accounted for? In two ways, says St. Justin. The first explanation, he found ready made in the teaching of the Alexandrian Jews, and the other Apologists adopted it after him: it is to the effect that the Philosophers knew the Old Testament literature and drew therefrom the truths they transmitted to us.[1] The second, of which he himself is the author, is that the divine Logos which at the origin of Christianity appeared under a human shape, as a matter of fact has always been at work and continually manifesting Himself in the world. Among the Jews, He showed Himself in theophanies, He spoke by the Prophets and taught by the sacred writers. Among the Pagans, too, He spoke and taught by the Philosophers. These of course possessed Him only in part (*κατὰ μέρος*): hence they have adopted erroneous views and reached the light with difficulty (*δι' εὑρέσεως καὶ θεωρίας*); nevertheless the seed of the Word, the seminal Word (*σπέρμα τοῦ λόγου, σπερματικὸς θεῖος λόγος*), which was infused, from the beginning, into every human mind, dwelt in them, and by its help, they were enabled to discover the truths they proclaimed, of which He was, so to speak, the parent (*συγγενές*). Hence there can be no opposition between Philosophy and Christianity. All those who lived with the Logos are Christians, even though, during their lives, they may have been considered atheists. Such were, among the Greeks, Socrates and Heraclitus; among the Barbarians, Abraham, Ananias, Azarias and others. Anything good and true that was ever uttered in the whole world belongs to the Christians: *῞Οσα οὖν παρὰ πᾶσι καλῶς εἴρηται ἡμῶν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἐστι.*[2]

---

[1] Tatian, 1–3; Tertullian, 46; Hermias, the whole work.

[2] Tatian (35) calls likewise the Christian doctrine ἡ καθ' ἡμᾶς βάρβαρος φιλοσοφία.

[3] Μειζόνως καὶ θείως καὶ μόνοι μετ' ἀποδείξεως (*Apolog.* I, 20).

One can easily perceive the comprehensiveness of such a doctrine, which makes Philosophy a part of Christianity and seems to represent Jesus Christ only as continuing and crowning the work of Socrates.[3] Does St. Justin, then, place between Philosophy and the revealed Religion a mere difference of degree in the manifestation of the same truth, and does he really think that the Philosophers have been inspired by God, in the proper sense of the word, though in a limited measure? We do not think so. Though he nowhere expresses himself very clearly and seems here and there to speak of the *σπερματικὸς λόγος* as the personal and uncreated Word,[1] still it is more probable that, after all, he designates by this word human reason alone, derived indeed from the divine Wisdom, but itself created and finite. For he remarks, as we have said, that this seed of the Word is deposited in all men,[2] and, he observes "the seed and imitation imparted according to the capacity [of him who receives it] is one thing, and quite a different one is the being itself, of which the communication and the likeness is received through His grace." [3]

---

[1] *Apolog.* I, 44, 59; TATIAN, 40; THEOPHILUS, II, 37, 38; MINUCIUS, 34; TERTULLIAN, 47.

[2] *Apolog.* II, 13, 8, 10; *Apolog.* I, 46.

[3] *Apolog.* I, 5.

Now, this image of the Word has of course enabled the Philosophers to find out important truths, though not with the certainty and fulness which ought to have been reached. Sometimes, nay often, they have fallen into error, either because they possessed the Logos only imperfectly, or because the devil, the enemy of mankind, dragged them into falsehood. But with the Word incarnate, the full light has come: there is then no reason why one should still cling to an incomplete philosophy, to a half-truth which, besides, has been unable to enlighten and morally to improve the people: It is necessary to accept Christianity.[4]

Thus, though he acknowledged the efficacy of reason in as much as it is a more or less immediate participation in the divine intelligence, nevertheless St. Justin still proclaimed after all the moral necessity of revelation: a thesis that was confirmed by the lamentable sight which the history of Paganism offered to the eyes of the impartial spectator.

As a matter of fact, that history was the history of all kinds of crimes and absurdities: if its data concerning the gods were to be interpreted literally, Heathen mythology was nothing but a school of immorality. Naturally the Apologists did not fail to point out this feature of Paganism and to urge it against their adversaries;[1] they went further still and asked themselves why polytheism and idolatry had come into this world. The *moral* cause thereof they found in Satan's craft. He it is who, in order to pervert man, to separate him from God and enslave him to himself, has striven to act in such a way as to be considered a god. He has concealed himself in statues and has crept under images, he has taken hold of the soothsayers, made the entrails of the victims throb, guided the flight of birds, uttered deceitful oracles, and thus has drawn to himself adorations under the guise of idols whose worship he inspired. "Aemulantur [daemones] divinitatem," writes Tertullian, "dum furantur divinationem."[2] — As to the *historical* origin of Paganism, though the Apologists know of the theory that sees in the gods personifications of the forces of nature,[3] they take rather that theory which regards these gods as famous men of antiquity, who have been honored as divinities, sometimes for their merits and services, sometimes also, and too often, for their vices.[4]

---

[1] *Apolog.* I, 10, 46; *Apolog.* II, 13.

[2] *Apolog.* II, 8.

[3] *Apolog.* II, 13.

[4] *Apolog.* I, 9, 44, 54, 64; *Apolog.* II, 10, 13.

But the Apologists did not address themselves in their writings to the Heathen alone, they addressed themselves to the Jews also. The latter were to a great extent responsible for the persecutions raised against the Christians, for they had contributed to spread abroad the calumnies which were repeatedly heaped upon the followers of Jesus, and still continued to pursue them with their hatred and accusations.[1] Moreover, by speaking to the Jews, the Apologists perfected their demonstration of the truth of Christianity. Against the Pagans, they proved the absurdity of polytheism and the noble and essentially beneficial character of Christianity. By perusing the Sacred Books merely as works of a most ancient literature, they went still further, and in the name of the prophecies, claimed for the new Religion the right to be believed. The agreement of those prophecies with the events proved their divinity, and consequently the divinity of Christianity. St. Justin had already developed this argument in his first Apology (30–53). But in the controversy with the Jews, this argument was still stronger, since, as both parties agreed in admitting that the Prophets had written *κινήσαντος αὐτοὺς τοῦ θείου πνεύματος*,[2] the authority of these Prophets sufficed to settle the dispute. Now their authority was in every point favorable to Christianity. These thoughts are exposed at length in the *Dialogue with Trypho* (63, ff.) in which the author sets forth the details of the prophecies that have been fulfilled. — Taken as a whole, St. Justin's argumentation is forcible; but we need scarcely remark how loose and weak it is often in various details, when judged by our standard of textual and historical criticism.

---

[1] Aristides, 8–13; St. Justin, *Apolog.* II, 14; Tatian, 21, 25; Athenag., *Supplic.*, 20–21; Theophilus, I, 9; III, 3, 8; Minucius, 22; Tertullian, 21.

[2] Tertullian, 22; Tatian, 12, 16–18; St. Justin, *Apolog.* I, 54, 64; Minucius, 27.

[3] Aristides, 3–6, 13; Athenag., *Supplic.*, 22; Tertullian, *Ad Nationes*, II, 1; Hermias, 6.

[4] St. Justin, *Apolog.* I, 9; Athenag., *Supplic.*, 28–30; Theophilus, I, 10; II, 2; III, 3, 8; Minucius, 21, 23; Tertullian, 10, 11.

So, the writings of the Jews contained the Christian truth: they are our property more than the Synagogue's. With the new Economy, the old Law that had prepared it came to an end: it is abolished; Israel is no longer God's people: Christians are the spiritual Israel.[3]

---

[1] St. Justin, *Dialog.*, 16, 17, 108, 122, 123; *Apolog.* I, 31, 36.

[2] Athenag., *Supplic.*, 9; St. Justin, *Apolog.* I, 30, 31, 36.

[3] St. Justin, *Dialog.*, 11, 29, 43; *Epist. to Diognetus*, IV.

§ 3. — The Christian Doctrine in the Apologists.[1]

What is the doctrine of this new Israel? As has been already remarked, we should not expect to find in the Apologists a full exposition of it, but only some elements, which it is quite important for us to point out.

First we need scarcely remark that our authors consider as equally inspired the books both of the Old and of the New Testament and ascribe to the latter an authority like that of the former, though perhaps they do not place both on the same footing. It is the divine Word, says St. Justin, who moved the Prophets;[2] but Paul's word, Theophilus observes, is also God's word (*θεῖος λόγος*, III, 14, cf. 13), and one and the same Spirit of God has spoken through all the *πνευματοφόροι* (III, 12). These have been the mouthpiece by which He expressed Himself, the lyre of which He Himself struck the chords.[3]

However, it is not from Scripture that the Apologists usually borrow their concept of God. As they are Philosophers, they ascend to Him by the argument of causality[4] or by the teleological argument,[5] and conceive Him as transcendent and infinitely superior to anything we can say or think of Him: "Ideo sic eum aestimamus dum inaestimabilem dicimus. . . . Aufer additamenta nominum et perspicies ejus claritatem."[6] Nevertheless, to Him should be ascribed definite attributes, as well as the preëminent fulness of all the physical and moral perfections that can be found in creation.[7]

---

[1] In the following exposition, we do not include Tertullian, of whom we treat later on.

[2] *Apolog.* I, 36.

[3] St. Justin, *Apolog.* I, 36; Athenag., *Supplic.*, 9; *Cohortatio ad Gentiles*, 8.

[4] Aristides, 1; Tatian, 4, 5; Theophilus, I, 3–7.

[5] Minucius, 17–19.

[6] Minucius, 18; Aristides, 1; St. Justin, *Apolog.* I, 61; Tatian, 4.

[7] Aristides, 1; Theophilus, I, 3, 4.

This creation is His work: He drew it from nothing (*ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων*[1]), not however directly by Himself, but by His Word: for the Apologists encounter the same difficulty as Plato and Philo, in their attempts to reconcile with their transcendent conception of a God infinite, immutable and perfect, the creation of a world finite, imperfect and mutable. Between the God of their philosophy and the contingent beings, an intermediary is needed. Following on the footsteps of St. John (1^3), they find it in the Word. This doctrine, which thus was based on Scripture, helped moreover to set forth the harmony between the two orders of creation and of redemption, a harmony which had been destroyed by Gnosis. The Word which was creator was also the revealer and redeemer of the New Covenant.

What idea do the Apologists present us of the Word? There are in the statements made on this topic by the chief among them, elements that have not the same value nor the same origin. Some of these elements, derived from tradition, are true and correct: they constitute, as it were, the staple of the Apologists' teaching. But, besides, on these elements of tradition, as a basis, the authors just mentioned strove, under the influence of Platonic and Philonian philosophy, to build reasonings and theories; and these theories are far from being felicitous. They contain — let us say it with simplicity — they contain errors which enjoyed a certain success, though they came gradually to be known as errors and later on were rejected.

Let us examine the traditional elements first.

The unity of God is emphatically affirmed and maintained,[2] while at the same time three terms are distinguished in God: — the Father, the Son or the Word, and the Holy Ghost.[1] The Father is preëminently *the* God, *ὁ ὄντως θεός*,[2] though the Word too is God. All the chapters 56–62 of the *Dialogue with Trypho* are devoted exclusively to the proof that along with the supreme God there is another God who is more than an Angel, truly God: *θεὸς καλεῖται καὶ θεός ἐστι καὶ ἔσται*, (58). These words are not, on the part of the Apologists, an expression uttered more or less inconsiderately; they are part of a teaching exposed after thought and deliberation.

---

[1] Theophilus, II, 10; St. Justin, *Apolog.* I, 64; *Dialog.*, 11; Tatian, 5; Athenag., *Supplic.*, 4. St. Justin, it is true, speaks in a passage (*Apolog.* I, 10; cf. 59, 67) of an organization of the world ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὕλης, which would not be a true creation: but he seems rather to refer to an opinion of Plato.

[2] St. Justin, *Dialog.*, 11; Tatian, 5; Athenag., *Supplic.*, 4; Theophilus, III, 9; Minucius, 18, 19.

The Word is preëxisting and prior to any creature: He is God before all creation: *πρὸ ποιήσεως κόσμου ὄντα θεόν.*[3] Hence He Himself is not a creature, *κτίσμα* or *ποίημα.* Though the text of Proverbs (8^{22}): *κύριος ἔκτισέ με*, is too often applied to Him — v. g., St. Justin, *Dialog.*, 61 — still the term the most often used to designate His origin is that of *γεννᾶν.*[4] The Word is neither made nor created: He is begotten, and being begotten, He is Son of God. St. Justin connects the divine Sonship, not with the Incarnation, — as perhaps St. Ignatius does — but with a generation that preceded creation. The Word who, one day, is to be Jesus Christ, is the Son of God, the only one who is such preëminently: *Ὁ δὲ υἱὸς ἐκείνου* (*θεοῦ*) *ὁ μόνος λεγόμενος κυρίως υἱὸς, ὁ λόγος πρὸ τῶν ποιημάτων.* (*Apolog.* II, 6.)

Hence and because of this generation, the Son is distinct from the Father. The distinction is more or less clearly set forth by the Apologists: St. Justin insists strongly upon it. The Son is other than God the Creator, other numerically, though in agreement with Him: *ἕτερός ἐστι τοῦ πάντα ποιήσαντος θεοῦ, ἀριθμῷ λέγω, ἀλλὰ οὐ γνώμῃ* (*Dialog.*, 56). He is distinct from the Father, not merely in name, as the light is distinct from the sun, but numerically He is some one else: *ἀριθμῷ ἕτερόν τί ἐστι* (*Dialog.*, 128). Tatian and Athenagoras use equivalent expressions,[1] and we know the famous distinction between the *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος* and the *λόγος προφορικός*, of Theophilus of Antioch, the first to apply it to the divine Word (II, 22).

---

[1] St. Justin, *Apolog.* I, 6, 13; Athenag., *Supplic.*, 12, 24; Theophilus, I, 7; II, 15, 18.

[2] St. Justin, *Apolog.* I, 13.

[3] St. Justin, *Dialog.*, 56, 48, 61; Tatian, 5; Athenag., *Supplic.*, 10; Theophilus, II, 10, 22.

[4] St. Justin, *Dialog.*, 61; *Apolog.* I, 22, 23; *Apolog.* II, 6; Tatian, 5, 7; Athenag., *Supplic.*, 10; Theophilus, II, 10, 22.

So then, the Word is truly God, Son of God, begotten by Him, and really distinct from the Father. This is the whole substance of the Nicene definition; and to get that definition itself, it would suffice to apply to these premises a sound logic and a precise terminology. This our authors failed to do: their stumbling-block was the problem of creation. God is eternal, immutable: and yet, at a certain moment, He has created outside of Himself. Has any change, then, taken place in Him? They seem to give an affirmative answer, and to say that there has been the bringing forth (uttering), the generation of the Word.

The Word was in God from all eternity; that God has always been *λογικός*, all admit.[2] How did the Word exist in God? As a person distinct from the Father or as a mere power, as immanent reason? The Apologists do not give a clear answer. Two texts of St. Justin have been pointed out (*Apolog.* II, 6; *Dialog.*, 61) that seem to favor the latter view; but they are not explicit enough to be interpreted with certainty in this sense, and in this sense alone. The holy Doctor goes back before creation: he regards the Word as personal God before all created things (*Dialog.*, 48, 61, 62); he does not ascend beyond; for him this is practically eternity. Tatian is still less affirmative than his master as to the personal and eternal existence of the Logos. In the beginning, he says, God is alone: though He is endowed with His *λογικὴ δύναμις* which He brings forth (utters) at the moment of creation (5). We find in Athenagoras (10) and in Theophilus of Antioch (II, 10, 22) the same obscurity or rather the same disconcerting formulas. The latter seems even to advance towards error, with his theory of the two states of the Logos, who was at first enclosed, as it were, in the bosom of the Father (*ἐνδιάθετος*), existing there merely as His intelligence and sentiment (*νοῦς καὶ φρόνησις*), and then afterwards brought forth (uttered) by Him externally (*προφορικός*).

---

[1] TATIAN, 5; ATHENAG., *Supplic.*, 10.

[2] *Ibid.*

At any rate, whether our Apologists thought the Word really distinct from the Father from all eternity or not, it is before and with a view to creation that they place His being uttered and begotten, that the Word becomes the *Son*. Some attempts have been made to interpret their words so as to give them the meaning of a mere new relation established by the creative act, between the Word and the created beings themselves: but this explanation does not account for the texts. These imply that, at the moment of creation, a change has taken place in the inner state of the Logos. God needs the Logos to create, produce and reach what is contingent, external, imperfect, mutable. Hence He draws it from His bosom as it were; He begets and brings It forth (utters), that It may be His instrument and organ in the act of creation: *Γεννώμενος (ὁ υἱός) ὅτε τὴν ἀρχὴν δι' αὐτοῦ πάντα ἔκτισε καὶ ἐκόσμησε ὁ θεός* (St. Justin, *Apolog.* II, 6; cf. *Dialog.*, 61). — *Προπηδᾷ προελθών* (Tatian, 5; Athenag., *Supplic.*, 10. —) *'Εγέννησεν (θεὸς) αὐτὸν (τὸν λόγον) μετὰ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σοφίας ἐξερευσάμενος πρὸ τῶν ὅλων.* — *Τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ἐγέννησε προφορικόν* (Theophilus, II, 10, 22). Thus produced to be the help of God (*ὑπουργός*) in creation, the Word is in one sense the first born of this creation: *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως* (Theophilus, II, 10, 22), the *ἔργον πρωτότοκον* (Tatian, 5).

This is the doctrine of the temporal generation of the Logos: the Word, *Word* from all eternity, has become *Son* only at a certain moment, the moment that preceded creation. But this bringing forth (utterance) — let it be observed once more — is a true *generation*, not a production *ex nihilo*. The Son was not made, remarks Athenagoras, like something that did not exist before (*οὐχ ὡς γενόμενον*, *Supplic.*, 10): He partakes of the nature of the Father who begets Him. The word *γεννᾶν* is the one that is used most often to characterize His origin.[1]

By this generation, then, is the Son separated from the Father, so that the latter is deprived of His Word and His substance divided? By no means. The Word, writes Tatian, "arises from a distribution, not from a division. What is divided is cut off from that from which it is divided; while what is distributed implies a voluntary grant and causes no defect in that from which it is drawn. For, just as from one torch several fires are lighted and the light of the first torch is not lessened by the fact that other torches have been lighted from it, so the Logos did not, by coming forth from the power of the Father, deprive of Logos Him by whom He had been begotten (*οὐκ ἄλογον πεποίηκε τὸν γεγεννηκότα*). I myself, for instance, talk to you and you hear me, and I who am addressing you, by the fact that my logos is transmitted from me to you, am not deprived of it; but by the utterance of my word, I intend to order the confused matter that is in you (5)."[2] This is exactly what St. Justin says (*Dialog.*, 61, 128), and what Athenagoras (*Supplic.*, 10) and Theophilus (II, 22) suppose. We find there, the origin of the *φῶς ἐκ φωτός* of Nicæa.

However, as creation is the work of the divine will, our

---

[1] On this point, however, Tatian is less explicit.

[2] The French translation of this passage is by Puech, *Recherches sur le Discours aux Grecs de Tatien.*

Apologists ascribe likewise the generation of the Word to the Father's will. True, they do not affirm that it comes from His *free* will, but they do affirm that it comes from His will and power (*δυνάμει καὶ βουλῇ αὐτοῦ*).[1] Hence, also, the Word, the Son, is subordinate to the Father, not only as man after the Incarnation, but also as man and God. The Son is the Father's minister: "He has ever done only what the Creator of the world, above whom there is no other God, wished Him to do and say." "He is at the Father's disposal and presides over the fulfilment of His designs." No doubt, He is God and Lord, but "under the Creator of all (*ὑπὸ τὸν ποιητὴν τῶν ὅλων*)"; and it is this agreement of will that keeps up, notwithstanding the numerical distinction, the unity which Gnostics were anxious to break: *ἕτερος . . . ἀριθμῷ λέγω, ἀλλὰ οὐ γνώμῃ.*[2]

Finally, from the fact that the Word is brought forth (uttered) for the creation, it follows that He possesses, in order to come into contact with the finite and the contingent, an aptitude which the Father does *not* possess. The latter, in as much as He is a transcendent and measureless God, cannot appear upon earth, nor be present in a determined place; hence the Old Testament theophanies cannot be ascribed to Him. On the contrary, the Word is able to manifest Himself and can be seen and contained in one place: as a matter of fact, it is He who is spoken of in the Biblical narratives.[3] This last feature, which places between the Father and the Son such a great dissimilarity, takes us far away, as is evident, from the doctrine of consubstantiality; while it shows at the same time that the doctrinal inaccuracies of the Apologists have their source in their philosophy, in the consequences they drew with Plato and Philo, from God's absolute transcendence.

---

[1] St. Justin, *Dialog.*, 71, 127, 128; Tatian, 5.

[2] St. Justin, *Dialog.*, 56, 126, 60, 61, 127; *Apolog.* I, 13.

[3] St. Justin, *Dialog.*, 60, 127; Theophilus, II, 22.

This is what led them erroneously to maintain the temporal generation of the Logos, as well as His subordination and inferiority. As the Son was to be the divine instrument of creation, He was to exist only together with it and be somewhat similar to creatures. On the one hand, the philosophy of our authors did not go so far as to make them overlook the traditional elements of doctrine taken in themselves; on the other, under its influence, they failed to see fully and realize distinctly the bearing and consequences of these elements.

In such a philosophy, Harnack[1] observes, there is no room for the person of the Holy Spirit. Undoubtedly: still, we should not forget that the Apologists do not borrow their doctrine precisely from Philosophy. Hence they know the Holy Spirit, the Prophetic Spirit, the image and similitude of God (*θεοῦ εἰκὼν καὶ ὁμοίωσις*), a portion of God (*θεοῦ μοῖραν*) the *deacon* of the suffering God (*διάκονος τοῦ πεπονθότος θεοῦ*).[2] Athenagoras has been accused of not sufficiently distinguishing the Holy Spirit from the Father; and it is true that he makes of the former an emanation (*ἀπόρροια*) of God and establishes between them the same relation as between the light and the fire, the ray and the sun:[3] — the very relation which St. Justin judged insufficient to mark the real distinction of persons (*Dialog.*, 128). These difficulties, however, whose bearing, besides, cannot be determined with precision, do not hold against the explicit texts in which Athenagoras names, beside the Father and the Son, the Holy Spirit as a third term with the same title as the two others: — nay, he observes that, though these three terms are united in power, they are distinct as to rank: *τὴν ἐν τῇ ἑνώσει δύναμιν,καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ τάξει διαίρεσιν.*[4] A reproach similar to this, namely of confounding the Holy

---

[1] *Lehrb. der D G.*, I, p. 489; *History of Dogma*, vol. II, pp. 208, 209.

[2] St. Justin, *Apolog.* I, 6, 13; Tatian, 7, 12, 13.

[3] *Supplic.*, 10, 24.

[4] *Supplic.*, 10, 12, 24.

Spirit with the Word — has been likewise made by Petavius[1] against Theophilus of Antioch, because the latter calls the Holy Spirit and the Word both by the name of Wisdom (*σοφία*) and ascribes to them indiscriminately the inspiration of the Prophets.[2] But this second objection is not more conclusive than the first: for in other passages (I, 7, 11, 18), Theophilus enumerates the three terms *θεός*, *λόγος*, *σοφία*, and in book II, 15, tells us expressly that they make up a trinity (*τριάς*), — a word which he is the first to use.

So we find in the Apologists the first sketch of a Trinitarian doctrine. The one who summed it up best and marked most clearly both the unity of nature and the distinction of persons is Athenagoras. The Christians, he observes, know "a God and His Word, what is the union of the Son with the Father, what is the communication of the Father with the Son, what is the Spirit, what is the union and the distinction of those who are thus united, the Spirit, the Son, the Father" (*Supplic.*, 12). "The Father and the Son are but one: the Son is in the Father, the Father in the Son in the unity and power of the Spirit. . . . Who, then, would not be astonished to hear these men called atheists who proclaim a God the Father, a Son who is God, and a Holy Spirit who show their power in the unity and their distinction by the rank?" (*Supplic.*, 10.)

Christology did not come within the range of the discussions between the Apologists and their Pagan antagonists. Hence if we except St. Justin, they are rather meagre on this topic. Aristides merely sums up the history of Jesus Christ according to the Gospel.[3] Tatian has only two words: one, already quoted, about the suffering God (13); the other, which designates Jesus Christ as *θεὸν ἐν ἀνθρώπου μορφῇ* (21). The Epistle to Diognetus acknowledges likewise the Saviour as

---

[1] *De Trinitate*, lib. I, cap. III, 6.

[2] *Ad Autolyc.*; cf. II, 10, 15 with II, 22; II, 10 with II, 30, 33.

[3] Syriac text, 2; Greek text, 15.

God (VII, 4, 8, 9), God's proper and only son (IX, 2; X, 2), who, always being Word, has to-day become Son (XI, 4, 5: — perhaps an echo of the doctrine that regards the divine Sonship as acquired by the human birth). This Word has become man among men (VII, 4), has taught us to know God (VIII, 1) and saved us, because in Him who alone is just, the iniquity of many has been concealed: "O sweet substitution (ὢ τῆς γλυκείας ἀνταλλαγῆς)!" exclaims the author, "O unfathomable invention! O unhoped for blessing, that the iniquity of many is hidden in one just man alone, and that the justice of one justifies many sinners!" (IX, 5.)

St. Justin is still more complete. He does not content himself with demonstrating by means of the prophecies the divine mission of Jesus Christ; this he had already done in his argumentations against the Pagans and the Jews; he considers also the Incarnation and the Redemption in themselves, in their nature and consequences.

First of all he notices the identity of the Word, the Son of God and Jesus Christ; Jesus Christ is the Word, the Son of God made flesh (σαρκοποιηθείς), who has become man.[1] He consisted of body, Logos and soul (σῶμα καὶ λόγος, καὶ ψυχή, *Apolog.* II, 10). Thus the holy Doctor indirectly affirms his belief in the personal unity of Jesus Christ.

The body of Jesus was real,[2] and His birth, virginal;[3] St. Justin establishes this last point by the text of Isaias, 7^{14}: *Ecce Virgo concipiet.*[4] Nevertheless, Jesus is of our race, of the race of Jesse, Juda, Jacob and Abraham; He passed, as we do, through the infirmities of childhood and the growth of age; He could and did suffer, as we do, δηλῶν διὰ τούτων ὅτι ἀληθῶς παθητὸς ἄνθρωπος γεγένηται: like us, He was subject to dread and fear.[1] Some (Semisch, Neander), founding themselves on the second Apology, 10 (cf. above), have accused St. Justin of not admitting in Jesus Christ a rational soul and of ascribing its functions to the Word. But not to insist that in this passage the holy Doctor may have given to the word ψυχή a broader meaning than that of animal soul, the accusation falls to pieces when confronted with the text of the *Dialogue* (105), in which the Saviour is set forth as giving up on the cross His πνεῦμα, and asking that His soul may not fall, like ours, under the dominion of the infernal powers. To this text we may also add the words of the 72nd chapter, as to the descent of Jesus Christ into Hell.

---

[1] *Contra Marcionem*, ap. IRENAEUM, IV, 6, 2; *Apolog.* I, 5, 23, 32, 46, 63; *Apolog.* II, 6; *Dialog.*, 45, 48, 63, 84.

[2] *De resurrectione*, 1, 2.

[3] *Apolog.* I, 22, 31, 32; *Dialog.*, 45, 63, etc.

[4] *Apolog.* I, 33; *Dialog.*, 43, 66.

However, by becoming man, the Word has not ceased being God, and He did not need the inpouring of the Holy Spirit to complete the gifts that were in Him.[2] The names He has received and still receives show that He is both God and man. As man, He is preëminently *the* Just One: He is also God's eternal priest, our priest.[3]

The Soteriology of St. Justin is less developed than his Christology; yet, it would be an exaggeration to say, as has been done, that the idea of expiation and of the *substitutio vicaria* is not at all to be found in his works. Not only does the holy Doctor repeat that Jesus Christ has suffered for us in order to redeem us,[4] but he observes that as all men were subject to malediction because of their sins, the Father required that His Christ should receive in Himself the maledictions of all. Not that this Christ was actually cursed by God: *we* were cursed by God, and He suffered for mankind.[5] The author remarks also that death is the result of sin, and that, nevertheless, Jesus underwent it, not for His sake, but for the sake of men;[1] hence it follows that the Saviour took on Himself the chastisement of sin, and thus did away both with sin and death.

---

[1] *Apolog.* I, 31, 32; *Dialog.*, 43, 46, 78, 84, 88, 99, 100, 103, 104, 111, 113, 125.

[2] *Dialog.*, 87, 88.

[3] *Dialog.*, 126, 17, 102, 110, 96, 115.

[4] *Apolog.* I, 63; *Dialog.*, 41, 134.

[5] *Dialog.*, 95.

Below Jesus Christ, the Apologists place the Angels, created before man, intelligent and free.[2] According to Athenagoras (*Supplic.*, 10), they are God's ministers for the government of the world. In a well-known passage (*Apolog.* I, 6), St. Justin mentions them between the Son and the Holy Spirit. But, in addition to this passage being unique, such an order is accounted for by the holy Doctor's remark that the name of Angel has been often given to the Son, and by his purpose merely to show that the Christians are not atheists. At any rate, the text proves that the Angels were then an object of veneration (*σεβόμεθα καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν*). Several of these Angels did not remain in the right path: some sinned with the daughters of men; others became guilty of faults of various kinds.[3] The devil, Satan, is the most perverse of all, the special enemy of God, the author of Adam's fall.[4]

The Apologists distinguish in man two elements: the body and the soul. Nay, on the strength of the 10th chapter of the fragment *De resurrectione*, St. Justin has been accused of distinguishing three elements; for there we read that the body is the house of the soul, and the soul, that of the spirit: *οἶκος γὰρ τὸ σῶμα ψυχῆς, πνεύματος δὲ ψυχὴ οἶκος*. However, to judge him from his works taken as a whole, he seems to have been a dichotomist.[5] The *πνεῦμα* mentioned in the previous text is not the rational soul, the *νοῦς*, but rather the Spirit of God, the principle of supernatural life. Likewise it has been pointed out that the Apologists in general, and particularly St. Justin, greatly extol the freedom of man [1] and ascribe very little to grace. This attitude is explained by the demands of controversy and by the philosophy from which they draw their inspiration. Besides, it is not correct to affirm that the doctrine of grace has no place at all, not even in St. Justin's works. On the contrary, the latter implies in many places the necessity of the Divine help.[2]

---

[1] *Dialog.*, 88.

[2] Tatian, 7; St. Justin, *Dialog.*, 88.

[3] St. Justin, *Apolog.* II, 5; Athenag., *Supplic.*, 24.

[4] St. Justin, *Apolog.* I, 28; *Dialog.*, 103; Athenag., *Supplic.*, 24.

[5] *De resurrectione*, 7, 8, 9; *Apolog.* I, 8; II, 10; *Dialog.*, 105.

Perhaps the weakest point of the Apologists' anthropology is their teaching about the natural immortality of the soul. St. Justin denies it explicitly: in his opinion, immortality is a reward granted to the just, a chastisement inflicted on the wicked.[3] Tatian (13) entertains a similar view. Theophilus observes that many consider the soul immortal because it is a breath of life. Personally he thinks that *man* was created neither immortal nor mortal: he was to be one or the other, according as he would obey or disobey God. He disobeyed and has become mortal. But God mercifully offers him life, which he can deserve by fulfilling His law.[4]

Theophilus also clearly teaches the doctrine of the original fall.[5] Moreover St. Justin tells us that sins in general are blotted out by baptism and penance.[6]

Baptism is an illumination (φωτισμός): it is given in the name of the three Divine persons. Its effect is to regenerate us (ἀναγέννησις, παλινγεννεσία) and to forgive us our sins. Without it, there can be no salvation.[7]

---

[1] St. Justin, *Apolog.* I, 28, 43, 61; *Apolog.* II, 14; *Dialog.*, 88, 102, 141; Tatian, 7; Theophilus, II, 27.

[2] *Apolog.* I, 10, 61, 65; *Apolog.* II, 10; *Dialog.*, 47, 95, 119.

[3] *Dialog.*, 5, 6.

[4] *Ad Autolyc.*, II, 19, 27; cf. 24. The *Epistle to Diognetus* (VII, 8) admits the natural immortality of the soul.

[5] *Ad Autolyc.*, II, 17, 25; cf. St. Justin, *Dialog.*, 88. We may notice that Theophilus, II, 25, holds that Adam was created a child (νήπιος).

[6] *Apolog.* I, 61; *Dialog.*, 14; Theophilus, II, 16.

[7] St. Justin, *Apolog.* I, 61, 66; *Dialog.*, 44; Theophilus, II, 16.

As regards the Eucharist and the divine service, the precious description of it left us by St. Justin in his first Apology (65–67) is well known. Bread and wine mixed with water are the matter of the Eucharist;[1] the president (ὁ προεστώς) of the assembly consecrates them with the very words of Jesus Christ. Thus they become more than common bread and drink: they are the flesh and blood of Jesus incarnate, as He Himself was flesh and blood for our salvation. This Eucharist is distributed among all those who are present, and carried to the absent, by the deacons. The celebration of the Mysteries takes place on Sunday: it is accompanied by prayers, the thanksgiving of the celebrant, the kiss of peace, the reading of the Apostles' commentaries or of the Prophetical writings, the instruction and exhortation of the president of the meeting, and finally the offerings of the faithful for the poor and needy. In the 41st chapter of his *Dialogue*, St. Justin recalls the words of Malachias, 1^{10-12}, and says expressly that the Eucharist offered by the Christians is a sacrifice (θυσία).[2]

The eschatological doctrine crowns all this teaching. There are, observes St. Justin, two advents of Jesus Christ foretold by the Prophets, one in the lowliness of the Incarnation, the other in glory, with the Angelic host.[3] The resurrection of the body will take place in the second advent. We know that both St. Justin and Athenagoras wrote a treatise to establish this dogma and refute the objections that were raised against it. The other Apologists, Tatian (13), Theophilus (II, 14, 15), Minucius Felix (34) mention likewise the same doctrine. —

---

[1] Harnack wrongly maintained that St. Justin did not admit wine as matter of the Eucharist (*Brot und Wasser die eucharistischen Elemente bei Justin*, in the *Texte und Unters.*, VII, 2, Leipsic, 1891). Cf. SCHEIWILER, *Die Elemente der Eucharistie in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, Mentz, 1903.

[2] We may remark here, as belonging to the category of ecclesiastcial charisms, the power of casting out devils, which the Apologists testify was then enjoyed at least by some Christians (ST. JUSTIN, *Apolog.* II, 6, 8; TATIAN, 10; THEOPHILUS, II, 8).

[3] *Apolog.* I, 52; *Dialog.*, 49, 110.

This resurrection, St. Justin goes on to say, will be followed for the elect by a reign of one thousand years upon earth. True, he adds, as it has been already pointed out,[1] that many orthodox Christians do not hold this opinion: though, personally, he holds it and unhesitatingly admits what was its logical consequence, viz., the deferring of the beatific vision for the just.[2] His view is this: at the moment of death, the souls of the just and of the prophets used to fall under the dominion of the infernal powers, and we must pray that our souls may not meet with the same misfortune.[3]

St. Justin is the only one, among our authors, who speaks of the *millennium*. But all teach the judgment and the future rewards or punishments. The happiness of the elect will be everlasting;[4] so also the chastisements and the fire that will torment the reprobate both in their bodies and in their souls.[5] As to the material universe, it will perish in a universal conflagration.[6]

---

[1] Cf. p. 201.

[2] *Dialog.*, 80, 81.

[3] *Dialog.*, 105.

[4] St. Justin, *Dialog.*, 45, 120.

[5] St. Justin, *Apolog.* I, 8, 28; *Dialog.*, 45, 120, 130; Tatian, 5; Minucius, 35; *Epistle to Diognetus*, X, 7.

[6] St. Justin, *Apolog.* II, 7; Minucius 34.

CHAPTER VI

THE DOCTRINAL STRUGGLE AGAINST HERESY — ST. IRENÆUS [1] AND MELITO

While the Apologists were striving to turn aside the external persecution and to set up Christianity opposite Philosophy and Paganism, other writers devoted themselves to refuting the doctrinal errors that threatened the faith of the Church, especially the most important of all those errors: — Gnosticism; hence they have been called Antignostic Fathers. To this category St. Irenæus, St. Hippolytus and Tertullian belong. As these last two are to be studied elsewhere — for their activity was spent on other works also, — we shall here concentrate almost all our attention on the Bishop of Lyons.

---

[1] The edition quoted is that of D. Massuet in *P. G.*, VII. —H. Ziegler, *Irenaeus, der Bischop von Lyons*, Berlin, 1871. R. A. Lipsius, *Die Zeit des Irenaeus von Lyon*, in the *Historisch Zeitschrift*, vol. XXVIII, 1872. Fr. Boehringer, *Irenaeus der Bischop von Lugdunum*, 2nd edit., Stuttgard, 1873. A. Dufourcq, *Saint Irénée*, Paris, 1904. J. Werner, *Der Paulinismus des Irenaeus*, *Texte und Untersuch.*, vol. VI, 2, Leipsic, 1889. Fr. X. Funk, *Des Primat der römischen Kirche, nach Ignatius und Irenaeus*, in the *Kirchengeschichtl. Abhandl. und Untersuch.*, vol. I, 1897. A. Harnack, *Das Zeugnis des Irenaeus über das Ansehen der römischen Kirche*, in the *Sitzungsber. der K. preuss. Akad. der Wissen. zu Berlin*, 1873. J. Chapman, *Le témoignage de Saint Irénée en faveur de la primauté romaine* in the *Revue Bénédictine*, vol. XII, 1895. A. Camerlijnck, *Saint Irénée et le Canon du Nouveau Testament*, Louvain, 1896. J. Kunze, *Die Gotteslehre des Irenaeus*, Leipsic, 1891. L. Duncker, *Des hl. Irenaeus Christologie*, Göttingen, 1843. J. Koerber, *S. Irenaeus de gratia sanctificante*, Wurzburg, 1865. G. Molwitz, *De ἀνακεφαλαιώσεως in Irenaei theologia potestate*, Dresden, 1874. L. Hopfenmüller, *S. Irenaeus de Eucharistia*, Bamberg, 1867. M. Kirchner, *Die Eschatologie des Irenaeus*, in the *Studien und Kritiken*, vol. XXXVI, 1863. E. Klebba, *Die Anthropologie des hl. Irenaeus*, Münster in W., 1894; P. Batiffol, *L'Eglise Naissante et le Catholicisme*, 4th ed., Paris, 1909, pp. 238–276.

St. Irenæus is an Asiatic. By his origin, he belongs to that group of writers from Asia Minor, whose theological views present so much resemblance among themselves, that it has been rightly called the Asiatic school: a school with which several illustrious men were connected, though unfortunately most of their works are lost: Melito, bishop of Sardis, Apollinaris of Hierapolis, Rhodon, Miltiades, Apollonius, the adversary of Montanism, and others. Of these authors, St. Irenæus is the best known, the only one of whom we possess a complete work. Melito has left only fragments of works that deserve a better fate, indeed, than that of oblivion.

The great treatise of St. Irenæus *Against Heresies* — or to give its full title, Ἔλεγχος *καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεος*, composed between the years 176 and 199, is directed against the Gnostics, more especially against the Valentinians: but it states principles that reach far beyond this particular controversy, so that it has ever been considered as a refutation made beforehand of all heresies.

Immediately before the time when the work was composed, the canon of the New Testament had been determined for good and in its exclusive sense, both at Rome and in Asia Minor. Here and there, it is true, there was still some hesitation as to this or that book — St. Irenæus himself mentions as inspired writings the *Shepherd* of Hermas and *St. Clement's Epistle* (IV, 20, 2; III, 3, 3)[1]; — but the principle was laid down and the general limits were clearly marked out. The Bishop of Lyons quotes or knows all the books of the actual canon, except the *Epistle to Philemon*, which he does not quote, and the second *Epistle of St. Peter*, with which perhaps he was not acquainted. The *Epistle to the Hebrews* is the only one whose authority he denied, though he knew and even quoted it.[1]

---

[1] However, his words do not prove that he regarded them as canonical; cf. Harnack, *Lehrb. der D G.*, I, 339, note 1; *History of Dogma*, vol. II, p. 55, note 3.

Now the Scriptures, says Irenæus, are perfect "since they were dictated by the Word of God and His Spirit" (II, 28, 2); the four Gospels especially determine the faith and are the norm of truth (III, 1). Nevertheless, it is not to Scripture that we must ultimately appeal against the Gnostics, — first of all because they themselves have spread many apocryphal works which they pretend are inspired (I, 20, 1); — then because, as they read the authentic Scriptures without any love for truth, they are not convinced by them (III, 11, 7); — finally, because they interpret them according to their own fancy (II, 10, 2, 3; III, 12, 7; 21, 3) and continually raise difficulties against them (III, 2, 1). In order more effectively to oppose these irreclaimable quibblers, we must bring forward a more simple rule of faith. This rule of faith is the symbol, the *κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀκλινῆς* which each Christian received at Baptism (I, 9, 4), and which cannot be changed, though it can be more or less perfectly understood and explained (I, 10, 3).

Where is that symbol to be found? — In the Church. In the Church there is found its formula, as well as the true faith of which it is a summary, and the genuine and sound preaching that explains it; in the Church that has received all these things from the Apostles themselves, through the uninterrupted series of her pastors; in the collection of the mother Churches that can show the catalogue of their bishops going back to the very origin of Christianity; in the teaching of the actual pastors to whom, through tradition, the truths they preach have come down, and who, by means of the *charisma veritatis certum* which they enjoy, preserve in its integrity the deposit of those divine truths. Whosoever wishes to learn with certainty anything about those truths must go to these pastors; from them he must ask the careful and exact explanation of the Scriptures (III, 3, 1, 4; IV, 26, 2, 5; IV, 33, 8; cf. IV, 32, 1; IV, 26, 5). The whole of religious truth has been entrusted to the Church by the Apostles. She has been granted, to keep and spread it without falling into error, that pledge of incorruptibility, — the Holy Ghost: hence from her and from the preaching of her bishops we must receive it, and is it useless to seek it elsewhere: "Tantae igitur ostensiones cum sint, non oportet adhuc quaerere apud alios veritatem quam facile est ab Ecclesia sumere, cum apostoli quasi in depositorium dives plenissime in eam contulerint omnia quae sunt veritatis, uti omnis quicumque velit sumat ex ea potum vitae" (III, 4, 1). "Hoc enim Ecclesiae creditum est Dei munus, quemadmodum ad inspirationem plasmationi, ad hoc ut omnia membra percipientia vivificentur, et in eo disposita est communicatio Christi, id est Spiritus sanctus, arrha incorruptelae et confirmatio fidei nostrae, et scala ascensionis in Deum . . . Ubi enim Ecclesia ibi et Spiritus Dei, et ubi Spiritus Dei illic Ecclesia et omnis gratia: Spiritus autem veritas" (III, 24, 1; cf. V, 20, 1).

---

[1] Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 232; cf. *Adv. haeres.*, II, 30, 9; Euseb., *H. E.*, V, 26. On all this cf. A. Loisy, *Histoire du Canon du Nouveau Testament*, Paris, 1891, pp. 103, ff. Th. Zahn, *Grundriss der Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, Leipsic, 1901, 2nd edit., 1904.

The ultimate criterion of truth is, then, found in the teaching of the Church, so that, to decide between heretics and orthodox, it suffices to know what is the teaching of the particular churches that make up the universal Church, and more particularly of those which go back to the Apostles, by the succession of their pastors (III, 3, 1). However, as it would be too long to consult all of them, it will suffice to examine what is the teaching of the Roman Church. For with her all the others must of necessity agree because of preëminent superiority. In and through her, the faithful spread all over the world have kept the tradition that has come down from the Apostles: "Sed quoniam valde longum est in hoc tali volu-

mine omnium ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, maximae et antiquissimae et omnibus cognitae, a gloriosis duobus apostolis Petro et Paulo Romae fundatae et constitutae Ecclesiae, eam quam habet ab apostolis traditionem et annuntiatam hominibus fidem per successiones episcoporum pervenientem usque ad nos indicantes, confundimus omnes eos qui, quoquo modo, vel per sibi placentia, vel vanam gloriam, vel per caecitatem et malam sententiam, praeterquam oportet colligunt. Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam propter potiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est eos qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his qui sunt undique conservata est ea quae est ab apostolis traditio." (III, 3, 2.)

Such is, briefly exposed, the celebrated testimony of St. Irenæus as to the doctrinal authority of the Church in general and of the Roman Church in particular. That authority is infallible, it is the property of the bishops and has for its absolute condition that these bishops be connected with the Apostles by an uninterrupted succession: ultimately, it is nothing but the work of the Spirit of truth living in the Church and securing the integrity of her faith and the inerrancy of her teachings.

We may now examine in detail the theology of the Bishop of Lyons.

We can truly know God only through the revelation He makes us of Himself (IV, 6, 4). Now, He has revealed Himself through His Word (IV, 6, 5; IV, 20, 4, 5). Yet, we cannot express His greatness: whatever perfections we proclaim in Him, He remains always ineffable: "Est autem et super haec et propter haec ineffabilis" (II, 3, 3, 4; cf. 8; I, 12, 2).

This supreme God is the Creator: the Gnostics wrongly distinguish Him from the Demiurge (II, 1, 1; III, 9–15, etc.). He is the God both of the Old and of the New Covenant, the only God, just and kind (III, 9–15; III, 25, 1–4; IV, 9–15). No doubt, there seem to be incongruities and disorder in nature; in reality and taking all in all, there is harmony and agreement (II, 25, 2).

However, in this one God St. Irenæus counts three terms: the Father, the Son and the Spirit (I, 10, 1; IV, 20, 1, 3; IV, 7, 4; II, 28, 6, ff.). The passage (III, 18, 3) brought forward to prove that he confounds the Son with the Holy Ghost, as well as the name of *Sapientia* which he often gives to the latter, cannot destroy the force of formal texts.

As regards the Word considered outside the Incarnation, our author is more sober. Being a man of tradition and having to struggle against adversaries who framed many systems about divine generations and operations *ad intra*, he confines himself to mere doctrinal statements and abstains from any speculation. He prefers generally the name of *Son* to that of *Word*.

The Son is God, truly God (III, 6, 1, 2). Like St. Athanasius later on, St. Irenæus sees in this divine character a condition of the Redemption as he conceives it. This Son identical with the Word (II, 28, 6; III, 18, 2; cf. III, 16, 6) is begotten by the Father (II, 28, 6), and this generation is eternal: "Semper autem coexistens Filius Patri" (II, 30, 9). "Non enim infectus es, o homo, neque semper coexistens Deo sicut proprium ejus Verbum" (II, 25, 3; cf. III, 18, 1). Thus Irenæus sets aside the doctrine of the temporal generation: he accepts neither the *projection ad extra* (προβολή) of the Gnostics, nor the theories of the Apologists. The question: How was the Son born? he merely answers by saying that the Father and the Son alone know it and that those men are lacking in common sense who pretend to explain it and who liken the uttering (prolation) of the Word to that of the human word: "Non sunt compotes sui. — Quasi ipsi obstetricaverint!" (II, 28, 6; cf. II, 13, 8.)

The special function of the Son is not to create — though He is "the hand" of God, by which the latter creates (IV, 20, 1; V, 6, 1), — but rather to reveal the Father. He is in the Father, and the Father in Him (III, 6, 2: IV, 4, 2): "Invisibile etenim Filii Pater, visibile autem Patris Filius" (IV, 6, 6). "Agnitio enim Patris est Filii manifestatio" (IV, 6, 3). It is through the Son that the Father is known to us, and manifests Himself first to the Angels and to the Heavenly Powers, from the beginning and before the creation of the world, and then to men (II, 30, 9; IV, 6, 5, 7; IV, 7, 3; IV, 20, 7).

Does this mean that, just as the Son's existence depends, according to the Apologists, on the creation, so also, according to St. Irenæus, it depends on the will of the Father to reveal Himself?[1] Our author certainly never thought of this question. For him the Son is "the visible one" of the Father, as the Father is "the invisible one" of the Son; and since the Father has always been essentially visible and knowable, the Son has always essentially existed: He is eternal like the Father. — On the other hand, we find most assuredly in the *Adversus haereses* some expressions savoring of subordinationism, as, for instance: the Son has received sovereignty from His Father (III, 6, 1; V, 18, 3); He is supported by the Father with creation, "for there exists but one God Father above all" (V, 18, 2); but St. Irenæus here only repeats the expressions of the Gospels and of St. Paul, and any one who considers the Father as the source of the Trinity can scarcely avoid a certain subordinationism.

As to the Holy Ghost, it is worthy of note that the Bishop of Lyons never calls Him — and in this, he follows the example of Scripture — by the name of God (IV, Pref., 4; IV, 1, 1); though he represents Him as eternal (*ἀένναον*, V, 12, 2), existing near God "ante omnem constitutionem," and produced by Him in the beginning of His ways, according to *Proverbs*, 8^{22} (IV, 20, 3).

---

[1] Harnack, *Lehrb. der D G.*, I, 539, 540; *History of Dogma*, vol. II, pp. 265, 266.

In regard to the Father, the Holy Ghost is His wisdom (IV, 20, 3 and *passim*), His *figuratio* (IV, 7, 4):[1] He and the Son are the "two hands" by which God has created and formed man (IV, Pref., 4; IV, 20, 1; V, 6, 1). As to the Church, the Holy Spirit is truth, grace, a token of immortality, a principle of union with God which Christ has communicated to her. The Divine Spirit is closely united with her and gives to her Sacraments their virtue and efficacy (III, 17, 2; III, 24, 1; V, 8, 1; cf. IV, 33, 7).

One of the aims of Gnosticism was to account for the presence of evil in the world: but this it did only by altering the faith. St. Irenæus finds the explanation in man's freedom and in the original fall. Man is naturally and necessarily neither good nor bad; he is free, and therefore subject to reward or to punishment (IV, 37, 1–3; IV, 3, 3; IV, 41, 2). On the other hand, because of his very condition of creature, he could not be perfect from the beginning: it was by obedience that he was to come nearer to his Creator and gradually reach perfection and immortality (IV, 38, 1, 3). Unhappily, instead of this, Adam and together with him all of us, who were included in him, did not comply with the will of God. The Bishop of Lyons is quite explicit: he draws a rigorous parallel between Adam and Jesus Christ. In Adam all of us have disobeyed and therefore have been punished; as we are born of him, we deserve to die: in Jesus Christ all of us have obeyed unto death, and as we are born again in Him, we receive life in inheritance: *᾿Εν μὲν γὰρ τῷ πρώτῳ ᾿Αδὰμ προσεκόψαμεν, μὴ ποιήσαντες αὐτοῦ (τοῦ θεοῦ) τὴν ἐντολήν· ἐν δὲ τῷ δευτέρῳ ῾Αδὰμ ἀποκατηλλάγημεν, ὑπήκοοι μεχρὶ θανάτου γενόμενοι* (V, 16, 3). "Percussus est homo initio in Adam inoboediens (V, 34, 2) . . . ut quemadmodum per priorem generationem mortem haereditavimus, sic per generationem hanc (Christi) haereditaremus vitam" (V, 1, 3; V, 12, 3; V, 14, 1, 3).

---

[1] Perhaps the text refers to the Holy Ghost as image of the Son. Cf. D. Massuet's note on this passage.

God has then worked at man's salvation, but progressively, and by giving him successively four covenants: from Adam to Noe, from Noe to Moses, from Moses to Jesus Christ, and the New, through our Lord (III, 11, 8; IV, 9, 3). Though the first two included only natural precepts (*naturalia legis*), whoever fulfilled them was justified (IV, 13, 1; cf. IV, 15, 1; IV, 16, 3). The third was a law of servitude indeed, but of servitude towards God, that led to Christ (IV, 15, 1; IV, 12, 5). The Gospel is the law of love and liberty (IV, 12, 2, 5; IV, 13, 2), a universal law that imposes more to believe and to do, but brings also more joy and grace (IV, 9, 2; IV, 11, 3; IV, 28, 2).

The Gospel was promulgated by Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ the redeemer — St. Irenæus affirms it over and over again — is not distinct from the Word-creator: He is the Incarnate Word (III, 16, 6; cf. III, 9, 3; 16, 7–9). Why did He become incarnate? Because we could reach immortality and incorruptibility only on condition that He, who is by His very essence immortality and incorruptibility, should unite Himself with our nature, and by the very fact with all mankind whose members we are, and which He has, so to speak, summed up in Himself. This is the doctrine of the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, dear to our author (III, 16, 6; III, 18, 1, 7; III, 19, 1). Hence the blood and flesh of Jesus Christ were real (III, 18, 6, 7; III, 22, 1, 2, etc.); He was our brother, of our race, formed as we are (V, 14, 2, 3; III, 19, 3; III, 22, 2, 3, etc.); like ourselves, He had a human soul (III, 22, 1, 2; V, 1, 1; V, 14, 3). Of course, His birth was virginal — the third Book, 22, 1, 4–10, sets forth a formal demonstration of this point; — yet He passed through all the ages and states of manhood: "per omnem venit aetatem" (II, 22, 4; III, 18, 7); He went through the course of human destiny: He was tempted, He suffered, and experienced our sorrows and passions (III, 17, 4; III, 18, 1, 6; III, 19, 2; III, 22, 2; V, 21, 2).

How this union of the Word and of the human nature was wrought, St. Irenæus does not explain: he calls it a *commistio*, a *communio Dei et hominis* (IV, 20, 4), an ἕνωσις τοῦ λόγου τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸς τὸ πλάσμα αὐτοῦ (IV, 33, 11; cf. III, 16, 6; III, 19, 1); he is conscious, though, both of the personal unity it produces and of the duality of natures it preserves. " Ipse enim vere salvavit; ipse est Verbum Dei, ipse unigenitus a Patre Christus Jesus Dominus noster" (III, 16, 9; III, 19, 2, 3, etc.). "Ipsum Verbum Dei incarnatum suspensum est super lignum" (V, 18, 1; III, 9, 3). On the other hand, our author remarks, the Saviour must of necessity have been really both God and man, to mediate between Heaven and earth, to conquer the devil and to conquer him justly (III, 18, 7). Therefore He had a twofold birth: He was man to be tempted, Word to be glorified (III, 19, 2, 3; cf. III, 16, 3): "Secundum id quod Verbum Dei homo erat . . . secundum hoc requiescebat Spiritus Dei super eum . . . secundum autem quod Deus erat, non secundum gloriam judicabat, neque secundum loquelam arguebat" (III, 9, 3).

Thus, being Word incarnate, Jesus summed up in Himself, as we have seen, all mankind and became for it a new Adam, a new chief in whom it recovered every blessing it had lost in the first Adam. " Quando incarnatus est et homo factus, longam hominum expositionem in se recapitulavit, in compendio nobis salutem praestans, ut quod perdideramus in Adam, id est secundum imaginem et similitudinem esse Dei, hoc in Christo Jesu reciperemus" (III, 18, 1; III, 21, 10; V, 23, 2). Jesus stood for us taken all together and individually: hence, the work of our redemption and salvation had already begun with the Incarnation itself, which made us enter, through Him, into communion with the Word's immortality and incorruptibility (III, 9, 1; III, 18, 7). However, this work was not complete: for though a redemption thus conceived would have certainly repaired the consequences of sin, corruption and death, yet it would not have atoned for the sin itself. Christ, our representative, was thus to allay God's anger. As sin is above all a disobedience, St. Irenæus insists chiefly on the obedience of Jesus Christ as *the* atoning act for sin: "Propitians quidem pro nobis Patrem in quem peccaveramus, et nostram inoboedientiam per suam oboedientiam consolatus" (V, 17, 1; III, 18, 6, 7). He speaks too of His sufferings and fast (V, 21, 2) and especially of His agony and death on the cross. The blood of Jesus Christ is the ransom with which He redeemed us. "Verbum potens et homo verus sanguine suo rationabiliter redimens nos, redemptionem semetipsum dedit pro his qui in captivitatem ducti sunt" (V, 1, 1; V, 2, 1; cf. V, 16, 3). His death was a sacrifice for our redemption: *Ἵνα καὶ ὁ θεὸς εὐδοκήσῃ . . . τὸν ἴδιον μονογενῆ καὶ ἀγαπητὸν υἱὸν θυσίαν παρεσχεῖν εἰς λύτρωσιν ἡμετέραν* (IV, 5, 4).

The effect of this Redemption is the overthrow of Satan who is justly defeated, our reconciliation with God, the divine image restored in us, the divine Sonship and above all immortality and incorruptible life received in and through Jesus Christ (III, 18, 7; III, 19, 1; III, 23, 1, 7; III, 24, 1; IV, 14, 1; V, 1, 1; V, 12, 6; V, 14, 1, 3; V, 16, 2, 3). The means of sharing in these fruits is faith in Jesus Christ — for by this faith alone the Patriarchs themselves and the Just of the Old Law were saved (IV, 2, 7; IV, 5, 4; IX, 7, 2; IV, 13, 1), — a faith that includes, not merely the assent of the mind, but also the fulfilment of the precepts: "Credere autem ei est facere ejus voluntatem" (IV, 6, 5; IV, 13, 1; V, 10, 1, 2).

Our spiritual regeneration is wrought through Baptism. This rite gives us a new birth and imparts to us the Holy Ghost (III, 17, 2). St. Irenæus implies clearly that it is administered to little children (II, 22, 4).

As to the Eucharist, it is the body and blood of Jesus Christ, into which the bread and wine are changed. This is undoubtedly the meaning of the various passages bearing on this subject, when taken all together. In the fourth Book, 17, 5, he records the words of the institution; then in chapter 18, 4, he asks the Gnostics how, with their doctrine, they can be sure that the bread over which thanksgiving is said is truly the Saviour's body, and the chalice, the chalice of His blood. The flesh, he goes on to say, is fed with the body and blood of the Lord: how then could it remain in corruption? how could it fail to share in life? . . . "Just as the earthly bread, that receives God's invocation, ceases to be a common bread, and becomes the Eucharist made up of two elements, one earthly, the other, heavenly (*ἐκ δύο πραγμάτων συνεστηκυῖα, ἐπιγείου τε καὶ οὐρανίου*), so also our bodies, by partaking of the Eucharist, cease to be corruptible and possess the hope of the eternal resurrection" (IV, 18, 5; cf. V, 2, 3). We must also mention here what Irenæus relates (I, 13, 2) of the magic spells of Marcus who, after praying, made the wine of the chalice appear red, in order that he might lead his followers to believe that the Superior Power he invoked had distilled his blood into the chalice: a proof that the Gnostics themselves admitted the real presence.

Besides, the Eucharist is not merely a Sacrament: it is also a sacrifice: the Bishop of Lyons affirms it several times: "Novi Testamenti novam docuit (Christus) oblationem, quam Ecclesia ab Apostolis accipiens in universo mundo offert Deo" (IV, 17, 5; IV, 18, 1, 4).

The eschatology of St. Irenæus remains to be exposed. This is decidedly primitive in character, and is inspired chiefly by the Apocalypse. As we have already remarked, St. Irenæus treats with anything but leniency those who think that immediately after death the souls of the just are allowed to enjoy the sight of God. Personally he believes that, as the soul of Jesus Christ had to wait in Limbo for the hour when His body was to rise, so also the souls of Christians wait, in an invisible place, for the hour when they rise, and, being clad again with their bodies, are brought into the Lord's presence

(V, 31, 2). This hour will be preceded by the apparition and defeat of Antichrist, and is to come after the world has lasted for six thousand years (V, 28, 3). St. Irenæus proves in twenty places, against the Gnostics, the resurrection of the body. He proves it by the very resurrection of Jesus Christ (V, 31, 2); by the dwelling of the Holy Spirit in us (V, 13, 4); by the Eucharist (V, 2, 3; IV, 18, 5). There will be a first resurrection for the Just, who are to reign with Jesus Christ during a thousand years (V, 32–35). Then the universal resurrection, each one reappearing in his own flesh (II, 33, 5; II, 34, 1), and the judgment (V, 32, 1) shall take place. The punishment of the wicked shall be everlasting (IV, 28, 2; IV, 40, 1, 2; V, 28, 1), as well as the reward of the Just (IV, 28, 2; V, 36, 1, 2) in the sight and possession of God (IV, 31, 2; IV, 35, 1); all these, however, will not equally share in that reward: for there are various mansions in the Father's house, and while some will be admitted into Heaven, others will dwell in Paradise, others finally, in the renewed Jerusalem (V, 36, 2). Death shall be destroyed, and the Son, who has received from the Father dominion over all things, submitting Himself to Him, God shall be all in all (V, 36, 2).

As far as we can judge from the fragments of the work of Melito of Sardis[1] that have been preserved, his doctrine was similar to that of St. Irenæus. Jesus Christ is truly God, God eternal: *θεὸς ἀληθὴς προαιώνιος ὑπάρχων* (fragm. VI, XV); He is man also, a perfect man, with a body and a soul like ours (fragm. VI; cf. EUSEBIUS, *H. E.*, V, 28, 5). Hence there are in Him two *natures;* — if the sixth fragment is authentic, which there is no decisive reason to doubt, — St. Melito was the first to declare expressly this doctrine: *θεὸς γὰρ ὢν ὁμοῦ τε καὶ ἄνθρωπος τέλειος ὁ αὐτὸς (Χριστὸς) τὰς δύο αὐτοῦ οὐσίας ἐπιστώσατο ἡμῖν.* Nevertheless, there is in Him only one person: this is constantly implied by the use our author makes of the *communicatio idiomatum* (fragm. VII, XIII, XIV, XVI). Finally, and this is a feature quite characteristic, the Bishop of Sardis, like St. Irenæus, knows the doctrine of the summing up or *recapitulation* of mankind in Jesus Christ (fragm. XIII).

---

[1] These fragments are gathered in OTTO, *Corpus Apologetarum*, IX. See C. THOMAS, *Melito von Sardes*, Osnabrück, 1893.

We may conclude this chapter by remarking that St. Irenæus closes what may be called a first period of the History of Dogma. With him, comes to an end that theology, which consists in little more than writing down the primitive data from Scripture or Tradition; only occasionally does it go further than this, and then with diffidence. He himself is its most faithful and complete representative. Preëminently a man of tradition, he abstains on purpose from speculating and from adding anything to what he believes to be the faith. Besides, this faith appears already in his works, with all its affirmations or at least with all the germs which afterwards will grow and develop. In the West, that development will take place calmly and gradually, and theology will lose nothing of that character of a preëminently traditional science, with which St. Irenæus had stamped it. Though it does not owe to him its formulas and technical language — these will be borrowed from Tertullian, — it *does* owe to him the substance of its teaching, and — which is more important in one way — that instinctive liking for the path of authority, in which it is to carry on its researches and make its progress. In the East, that development will be more rapid and somewhat sudden. A man appears, who, starting also from the data of tradition, shatters their framework into pieces and, a rival of the Gnostics, strives single-handed to compose a scientific and orthodox explanation of Christianity. A grand work indeed, though premature, the influence of which is destined to be widespread; many of its elements, however, will be given up one day, since they are the rough sketches of a mind more comprehensive than safe, and the dilapidated parts of an edifice built with too much haste.

CHAPTER VII

THE PRINCIPAL EARLY THEOLOGICAL SYSTEMS IN THE EAST — CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA AND ORIGEN

§ 1. — Clement of Alexandria.[1]

It is in the Church of Alexandria that was made, at the end of the second and at the beginning of the third century, that effort of which we have just spoken and which truly gave rise to Theology. The list of the bishops of that Church is all that we know of her, until that time. But suddenly, about the year 180, her catechetical school begins to shine with great lustre and becomes the cradle of most interesting and fruitful works.

---

[1] Edition Potter, *Clementis Alexandrini opera quae exstant omnia*, Oxford, 1715, in *P. G.*, VIII, IX. Vol. VIII contains the *Cohortatio*, the *Pædagogus* and the first four *Stromata*; Vol. IX, the other works. As the divisions are generally long, I always mention the column of the *Greek Patrology*. Consult also, for the *Adumbrationes*, Zahn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons, Supplementum Clementinum*, Erlangen, 1884. — Works: J. Kaye, *Some Account of the Writings and Opinions of Clement of Alexandria*, London, 1835; 2nd edit., 1890. C. Bigg, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, Oxford, 1886. E. de Faye, *Clément d'Alexandrie*, Paris, 1898. H. Kutter, *Das Christentum des Klemens von Alexandrien*, in the *Schweizerische theolog. Zeitschrift*, XVI, 1899. P. Ziegert, *Zwei Abhandlungen über T. Flav. Klemens Alexandrinus*, Heidelberg, 1894. A. Aall, *Der Logos, Geschichte seiner Entwicklung* . . . II, Leipsic, 1899. G. Th. Hillen, *Clementis Alexandrini de SS. Eucharistia doctrina*, Warendorp, 1861. W. De Loss Love, *Clement of Alexandria, not an after-death Probationist or Universalist*, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Oct. 1888. J. Winter, *Die Ethik des Klemens von Alexandrien*, Leipsic, 1882. G. Anrich, *Klemens und Origenes als Begründer der Lehre von Fegfeuer*, Tübingen, 1902. K. Ernesti, *Die Ethik des T. Flavius Klemens von Alexandrien*, Paderborn, 1900. Markgraf, *Klemens von Alexandrien als asketisscher Schrifsteller*, in the *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XXII, 1901. W. Capitaine, *Die Moral des Clemens von Alexandrien*, Paderborn, 1903. W. Wagner, *Der Christ und die Welt nach Clemens von Alexandrien*, Göttingen, 1903. H. Eickhoff, *Das Neue Testament des Klemens Alexandrinus*, Schleswick, 1890. P. Dausch, *Das neutestamentliche Schriftkanon und Klemens von Alexandrien*, Friburg in Brisgau, 1894. H. Kutter, *Klemens Alexandrinus und das Neue Testament*, Giessen, 1897; P. Batiffol, *L'Eglise Naissante et le Catholicisme*, Paris, 1909, pp. 295–316.

The first illustrious name of that school is the name of Pantenus, who left after himself only a highly revered memory.[1] He was succeeded by Clement, at first his disciple, who for some twelve years, from the year 190 to the year 202–203, was, either alone or with his master, the leader of the *Didascaleion.*

The three great treatises that still remain of Clement: the *Exhortation to the Greeks*, the *Pedagogue*, and the *Stromata* are, as it were, three parts of a work that formed a whole, though it has remained unfinished. They constitute, with the *Quis dives salvetur* and what remains of the *Hypotyposes* (Sketches) chiefly in the *Adumbrationes in epistulas canonicas*, the chief source where the author's theology is to be studied.

To understand this theology, one must not forget that Clement is both a strong Christian and a stanch philosopher. The former feature has not always been sufficiently noticed. Not only Clement's piety sometimes overflows in a way truly admirable;[2] he also acknowledges the authority of the Ancients and of the Church's tradition and protests that he intends to abide by it: "He ceases," he says, "to be a man of God and faithful to the Lord, who discards with contempt the ecclesiastical tradition and yields to the opinion of human heresies."[3] On the other hand, his taste, nay, his enthusiasm for Philosophy, is well known. However we may observe that by Philosophy, he does not mean the system of this or that school, but in general the whole collection of the doctrines that teach righteousness and piety, of which every school supplies its share.[1] Clement is an Eclectic. Plato and Pythagoras are his favorite masters, and after them, Zeno and Aristotle. He excludes only Epicurus and the Sophists.[2] That Philosophy, he thinks, played in the past a providential part: "It led the Greeks to Christ as the Law led the Hebrews to Him." It was given to them "as a covenant to be used by them, which was to be for them as a step in order to reach the Philosophy according to Christ." [3] Not indeed that it had an origin as immediately divine as revelation itself: it does not come from God essentially, directly (*κατὰ προηγούμενον*), but only indirectly and by way of consequence (*κατὰ ἐπακολούθημα*), either because most of it was drawn from those books of the Old Testament which were known to the Heathen, or because reason which originates Philosophy and brings it into shape is a gift of God.[4] Anyhow, its actual part is to be the helpmate of faith in the study the latter makes of its own deep mysteries: it must aid this *faith* to build itself into *gnosis*. True, the doctrines of Philosophy add nothing to the light of Christian truths; but its method and its dialectics train the mind and guide it in its seeking after truth, in its striving after good, in its apostolic endeavors to spread good and truth.[5]

---

[1] Euseb., *H. E.*, V, x.

[2] For instance, in *Cohort.*, XI, XII.

[3] *Stromata*, VII, 16, col. 532. Cf. also *Strom.*, I, 1, col. 700, 701. Harnack, *Gesch. der altchristlich. Litter.*, *Die Ueberlieferung*, pp. 291, ff., gives the list of the quotations Clement makes of the words of the πρεσβύτεροι.

While thus defining the actual rôle of Philosophy, Clement described his own undertaking: viz., by means of Philosophy, to search more and more deeply into faith, to transform the latter into a science, Revelation into a theology. However, while the Pseudo-Gnostics — as he calls them — had, under the pretext of reaching the very same end, substituted for faith their own fancies, Clement insisted on that faith remaining the foundation (θεμέλιος) of the whole building. He did not allow of any departure from the principles it laid down, from the facts it had ascertained, nor even of any investigation (ζήτησις) bearing on some truths that belonged exclusively to its domain. These conditions being fulfilled, the science of Revelation, he thought, would not be a human science, independent in character, but a divine science, controlled by the Church.[1]

---

[1] *Strom.*, I, 7, col. 732.

[2] *Strom.*, I, 8, col. 737; *Strom.*, I, 1, col. 688; V, 14, col. 173; VI, 8, col. 289.

[3] *Strom.*, I, 5, col. 717; VI, 8, col. 288, 289; VI, 5, col. 261; VI, 17, col. 392.

[4] *Strom.*, I, 5, col. 717; V, 14; VI, 2.

[5] *Cohort.*, XI, col. 229; XII, col. 237, ff.; *Strom.*, I, 20, col. 816; V, 14, col. 205; VI, 17, col. 380, 381; I, 6, col. 728; VI, 17, col. 385; I, 9, col. 740; I, 20, col. 813, foll.

These views of Clement of Alexandria are quite correct, and all that we can regret in this regard is that, sometimes, he himself did not follow them strictly. He shows already a tendency to deviate from them by the misuse he makes of the allegorical method in the interpretation of Holy Writ. True, the latter is for him the safe path of the true Religion; he acknowledges unhesitatingly its inspiration (θεόπνευστοι),[2] and includes in his canon almost the same books as we do;[3] but in exegesis he adopts Philo's principles. He applies them with unhesitating boldness to the Old Testament, whose facts, in his hands, vanish away into mere symbols: as to the New Testament, he is usually more reserved.[4] We find in the sixth book of *Stromata* (15 and 16, col. 356, ff.) his views on the nature and necessity of allegory in Holy Scripture.

---

[1] *Strom.*, II, 2, col. 940; V, 1, col. 12–13; VII, 10, col. 477; *Paed.*, I, 6, col. 280, foll.

[2] *Cohort.*, VII, col. 188, 189; VIII, col. 192, 193; *Strom.*, I, 21, col. 853; VII, 16; *Paed.*, I, 6, col. 308.

[3] He knows all the books of the New Testament, except the 2nd Epistle of St. Peter, the 3rd of St. John, and perhaps too that of St. James, which, however, he seems to quote (*Strom.*, VI, 18, col. 397). As to the Apocrypha and ancient writings which he cites as authorities or even as ἡ γραφή (v. g., the Didache, *Strom.*, I, 20, col. 817), it is difficult to state the exact value he sets upon them. Probably his canon was not well determined.

[4] See, however, his explanation of I *Cor.*, 3^2, in *Paed.*, I, 6, col. 292.

Scripture, the teaching of the Church and of the Ancients, Philosophy: these are, according to Clement, the three elementary factors of Theology. What doctrine did he frame with their help?

It is a doctrine in which the two elements, rational and divine, have left simultaneously their respective traces, and which, often, instead of combining, merely places side by side what is drawn from these two sources.

The God of Clement is indeed the God of Christians, a God real and concrete, eminently holy and kind, who watches over men and wills their salvation;[1] but He is also a God conceived in the Platonic fashion and so transcendent that He borders on abstraction: for He is above the whole world and all causes, above thought itself, above the One and the Monad.[2]

In this one God, Clement counts three terms. Some have doubted that he set between them a personal distinction: however, that he did is beyond question: Clement finds the Trinity even in Plato.[3]

The second term of this Trinity is the Logos. According to Photius (*Bibl.*, cod. 109), Clement held two beings of this name: one, Logos of the Father; another, who is the Son Himself: neither of whom, however, strictly speaking, became incarnate, as the incarnation befits only a *δύναμις τις τοῦ θεοῦ οἷον ἀπόρροια τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ*, a kind of third logos emanating from the first. But probably Photius made a mistake. Clement distinguished only between the intelligence of God, which is at once immanent and the Father's attribute, and the personal Logos who is the Son.

---

[1] *Strom.*, II, 2, col. 936; V, 10, col. 101; VII, 12, col. 496–497; V, 1, col. 16; VI, 17, col. 388, ff.; *Cohort.*, X; *Paed.*, I, 9, col. 353, 356; II, 10, col. 517.

[2] *Paed.*, I, 8, col. 336; *Strom.*, V, 10, col. 100; V, 11, col. 108, 109; V, 12, col. 121, 124; VII, 1, col. 404.

[3] *Paed.*, I, 2, 6, col. 280, 300; III, 12, col. 680, 681; *Strom.*, V, 14, col. 156; VI, 7, col. 280; *Quis dives salvetur*, 34, col. 640.

As to the latter, our author affirms directly His eternal generation: this is the characteristic teaching of the Alexandrian school in opposition to the Apologists. This generation not only preceded creation: it had no beginning, no starting-point (ἀνάρχος), for the Father is Father only on condition that He has a Son:[1] "*Cum dicit* (*Joannes, I Joan.*, 1^1): *Quod erat ab initio, generationem tangit sine principio filii cum patre simul exstantis.*"[2] True, the Word came forward (προελθών) at the moment of creation and as its immediate author: but this fact does not imply two states in Him; He has not been subject to the προβολή.[3]

Born of the Father from all eternity, the Logos is like Him, He is truly God as the Father is: ὁ φανερώτατος ὄντως θεὸς ὁ τῷ δεσπότῃ τῶν ὅλων ἐξισωθείς:[4] always present in all places and nowhere limited, He is all intelligence, He sees, hears, knows and governs all.[5] His attributes are the same as the Father's: the Father is in the Son and *vice versa*: to both, prayers are offered up: they are one and the same God.[6] Clement pushes so far the affirmation of their unity that he seems sometimes very near being a Modalist.[7]

And yet some have thought that in his works there are traces of subordinationism: for he not only applies to the Son the appellations Philo gives to the Word : but he also declares that the Father is πρεσβύτερος ἐν γενέσει, that the Son's nature (φύσις) is the nearest to Him who alone is all powerful, that the Son can be demonstrated and known, while the Father can be neither known nor demonstrated.[1] Nay, if Photius[2] is to be believed, Clement looked upon the Son as a creature; and it must be said that the Alexandrian doctor has, on this subject, expressions somewhat perplexing.[3] These, however, can be explained and do not destroy the impression that results from his doctrine taken as a whole. Even, some authors are unwilling to believe that he was truly subordinationist.

---

[1] *Strom.*, VII, 2, col. 409, 412; V, 1, col. 9.

[2] *Adumbrationes, P. G.*, IX, col. 734; ZAHN, p. 87.

[3] *Strom.*, V, 3, col. 33; VII, 2, col. 408.

[4] *Cohort.*, X, col. 228.

[5] *Strom.*, VII, 2, col. 408.

[6] Ἓν γὰρ ἄμφω ὁ θεός (*Paed.*, I, 8, col. 325); *Paed.*, I, 7, col. 312; III, 12, col. 681; *Strom.*, V, 6, col. 65; VII, 12, col. 500, 501.

[7] *Paed.*, I, 8, col. 333, 336.

Concerning the Holy Ghost, our author says nothing special, nothing that is not already found in Holy Writ.[4] However, the reader's attention may be drawn to the passage where he calls the Son and the Holy Spirit "primitivae virtutes ac primo creatae, immobiles existentes secundum substantiam."[5]

As we have seen, the Word is the immediate agent of creation. Clement understands this creation in the strict sense: neither spirit nor matter are eternal:[6] furthermore, he does not seem to have taught, as Origen did later on, the preexistence of souls.[7] On the other hand, he is trichotomist. Man possesses two souls: one, carnal and sensitive (*σαρκικὸν πνεῦμα*), the other, intelligent and ruling (*λογιστικὸν καὶ ἡγεμονικὸν*), that is not begotten with the body,[8] and is endowed with freedom, for God intends us to work out, by ourselves, our salvation: *ἡμᾶς δὲ ἐξ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν βούλεται σώζεσθαι.*[9]

Neither is the body essentially evil, nor the soul, essentially good: sin is our own deed, a deed, though, which is natural and common to all of us: the Logos alone is without sin.[1] Clement nowhere speaks clearly of original sin. True, he knows the disobedience of our first parents and thinks that, as they were created in a state of infancy, their fault consisted in uniting in wedlock, before the time appointed to them by God; true, he admits also that by his sin Adam gave to men an example which they are not slow to follow; but he seems to deny the imputation that might be made to them of that sin, by affirming that only the acts of our choice (*κατὰ προαίρεσιν*) can be imputed to us.[2]

---

[1] *Strom.*, VII, 1, col. 404; VII, 2, col. 408; IV, 25, col. 1365.

[2] *Codex* 109. Rufinus of Aquileia also points out in Clement's work passages that have the same meaning, though he supposes they were interpolated (*Epilogus in Apologetic. S. Pamphili*, edit. of Origen by Lommatzsch, XXV, 387).

[3] *Strom.*, V, 14, col. 132; VI, 7, col. 278; *Adumbrationes*, col. 735, 736.

[4] *Cohort.*, VIII, col. 188, 189; *Strom.*, IV, 26, col. 1373; VII, 2, col. 413; VII, 14, col. 351, foll.

[5] *Adumbrationes*, col. 735, 736.

[6] *Strom.*, V, 14, col. 136, 140.

[7] *Strom.*, III, 13, col. 1193; IV, 26, col. 1373–1377. See, however, *Quis dives salvetur*, 33, col. 273; VI, 16, col. 360.

[8] *Strom.*, VI, 6, col. 273 ; VI, 16, col. 360.

[9] *Strom.*, VI, 12, col. 317; VI, 16, col. 360; IV, 21, col. 1341; II, 15, col. 1000; VII, 7, col. 468.

It was to free us from sin that the Word became incarnate.[3] Although our author, engrossed with the knowledge of God brought by Jesus Christ, sees in the latter's being chiefly its divine and invisible element, yet he is not ignorant of, nor does he disregard His humanity, as well as the part it played in the work of salvation.

The Word, then, became incarnate, begot Himself — so to speak, in His incarnation, was born of David's race, of a Virgin: the Word incarnate is Jesus Christ: *οὗτος γοῦν ὁ λόγος ὁ Χριστός*.[4]

Photius has charged Clement with Docetism.[5] The accusation is only partly deserved. On one hand, Clement sets aside Docetism strictly so called; he admits in Jesus Christ a real body, a material blood, a passible manhood; [6] on the other hand, he thinks that His body was free from the common and natural necessities of eating and drinking, and His soul, from the motions of passions (*ἀπαθὴς τὴν ψυχήν*), from joy and sadness. He even records, without any disapproval, a certain tradition that represented the Saviour's flesh as impalpable and offering no resistance to the sense of touch.[1]

---

[1] *Strom.*, II, 15, col. 1000, 1004; IV, 26, col. 1373, 1377; *Paed.*, III, 12, col. 672; cf. *Cohort.*, XI, col. 228.

[2] *Strom.*, II, 15, col. 1004; III, 17, col. 1205; III, 14, col. 1193, 1196; *Cohort.*, XI, col. 228; *Adumbr. in epist. Judae*, col. 733.

[3] *Cohort.*, XI, col. 228, 229.

[4] *Cohort.*, I, col. 60, 61; XI, col. 228, 229; *Strom.*, V, 3, col. 33; V, 14, col. 161; *Paed.*, I, 6, col. 300; III, 1, col. 556.

[5] *Biblioth.*, cod. 109.

[6] *Strom.*, III, 17, col. 1205, 1208; VI, 9, col. 292; VII, 17, col. 553; V, 6, col. 58; *Paed.*, I, 2, col. 252; I, 6, col. 301; II, 2, col. 409; III, 1, col. 557; *Quis dives salvetur*, 37, col. 641.

On the whole, our author acknowledges in Jesus Christ two natures: the one Logos is at the same time God and man: *ὁ λόγος ὁ μόνος ἄμφω θεός τε καὶ ἄνθρωπος*: He is the Man-God (*ὁ ἄνθρωπος θεός*), who is for us a source of blessings, both as God and as man.[2] On the other hand, Clement regards Him undoubtedly as one only person whose personality resides in the Word. Instances of the communication of idioms occur frequently in his works, and he supposes that the hypostatic union persevered even during the *triduum mortis:* "The Word living and buried with the Christ is exalted with God."[3] As to the work of Jesus Christ, it is for Clement chiefly a work of revelation and teaching. Jesus Christ is our doctor and master, our true pedagogue.[4] Besides it is also a work of redemption and reconciliation. Jesus Christ gave up His soul for each one of us: He is our ransom (*λύτρον ἑαυτὸν ἐπιδιδούς*); He is propitiation for our sins (*ἱλασμός*), an immolated victim (*ὁλοκάρπωμα, θῦμα*) whose blood redeems us and reconciles us to God.[5]

Jesus calls all of us to the salvation that He has brought; it depends upon us to answer this call or not.[6] We answer it first of all by faith. What, then, is faith? Clement speaks of it often, but nowhere defines it with precision. He looks upon it as being, in general, a kind appreciation and an anticipated acceptance of that which will become the object of an intelligent comprehension. Then, applying this notion to religious truths, he derives from it the idea of faith properly so called.[1] From faith, he goes on to say, hope, that is, the waiting for the possession of the good, arises as well as fear and penance, that lead us to charity and science (*ἀγάπη καὶ γνῶσις*).[2] Thus understood, faith is *ἰσχὺς εἰς σωτηρίαν καὶ δύναμις εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, but it ought not to be separated from the fulfilment of the divine precepts; and though it suffices for salvation, yet it is but the beginning of the knowledge of God and of Christian perfection. Gnosis stands above.[3]

---

[1] *Strom.*, VI, 9, col. 292; cf. III, 17, col. 1161, 1164; *Paed.*, I, 2, col. 252; *Adumbr. in I Joan.*, 1^1, col. 735.

[2] *Cohort.*, I, col. 61; *Paed.*, III, 1, col. 557; I, 3, col. 257; cf. I, 2, col. 252.

[3] *Cohort.*, II, col. 97; *Paed.*, I, 5, col. 277, 280; I, 6, col. 301; *Cohort.*, X, col. 224.

[4] *Cohort.*, XI, col. 229, 232; XII, col. 240; *Paed.*, I, 6, col. 280; *Strom.*, VII, 10, col. 480.

[5] *Quis dives salvetur*, 37; *Paed.*, III, 12, col. 677; *Strom.*, V, 11, col. 108; *Cohort.*, X, col. 228.

[6] *Strom.*, II, 6, col. 960, 961.

Here we touch one of the most important points of Clement's doctrine. There is no doubt that he divided Christians into two categories: those who content themselves with the common faith (*κοινὴ πίστις*), and those who rise to Gnosis: though he expressly condemned the error that might regard this division as the result of a diversity of nature among men.[4] Far from excluding each other, these two states are intimately connected. Gnosis supposes faith, and faith contains Gnosis in germ, since it is the latter's foundation, and since the life of charity — the life of the true Gnostic — is nothing else than the development of the life of faith — the life of one who merely believes.[5]

What, then, should we exactly understand by a Christian Gnostic? Clement has described him in several places; in the seventh Stroma (10–14) especially, he has left us an ideal picture, in which it is easy to notice two principal features. First of all, the Gnostic has a knowledge and, as it were, an intuitive perception of the truths that faith prompts us to believe, without revealing to us their contents: he has the understanding of God and of things divine in general, of man and his nature, of virtue, of the supreme good, of the universe and its origin: the "great mysteries," of which the smaller ones are a mere preparation, are revealed to him.[1] Then the Gnostic leads a perfect life, characterized by the practice of two virtues: one Stoic, the other Christian. The former is insensibility (*ἀπάθεια*): the Gnostic has uprooted from his soul every passion and desire, all the sensible part of his nature: hence he has no need of the inferior virtues necessary for the struggle: no event can shake him, nor can he be reached by any emotion: he is the ideal philosopher of the Porch.[2] The latter virtue is charity (*ἀγάπη*), which is, as it were, the principle directing and rendering the whole life of the Gnostic fruitful. Charity prompts him to suffer for the Church and work at the conversion of souls, to love his enemies, forgive insults and endure martyrdom. The Gnostic prays always and everywhere, and his prayer is perfect, in as much as it is always submissive to the will of God.[3]

---

[1] *Strom.*, II, 6, col. 964; II, 12, col. 992; II, 2, col. 940.

[2] *Strom.*, II, 6, col. 961, 965.

[3] *Strom.*, II, 6, col. 961; II, 12, col. 992; V, 1, col. 21; VI, 14, col. 329; *Paed.*, I, 6, col. 285.

[4] *Paed.*, I, 6, col. 288, 293.

[5] *Paed.*, I, 6, col. 280, foll.

As it is easy to see, in his description of faith and Gnosis, Clement simply marked out the two degrees of Christian life, one of the common life, the other, of perfection. His originality consisted in introducing, on the one hand, into the idea of perfection, the intellectual and Platonic element of knowledge; on the other, the practice of the Stoic virtue of apathy, into its moral element. In this we recognize the two influences, philosophic and Christian, which told on his mind and reëchoed, as it were, in his teaching.

---

[1] *Strom.*, V, 11, col. 108; VI, 8, col. 289; VI, 10, col. 300; VII, 3, col. 421.

[2] *Strom.*, VI, 9, col. 292, foll.

[3] *Strom.*, I, 2, col. 709; IV, 4, col. 1225, 1228; IV, 9, col. 1284, 1285; VII, 1, col. 405; VII, 7, col. 449, 456; VII, 9, col. 477; VII, 12, col. 496, 501.

Thus attracted towards the problems of the inner life, both intellectual and moral, of the Christian, Clement studied comparatively little the external side of the Church, her rites and hierarchical organization. However, he did not ignore them altogether. For him the Church is the city of the Logos, the temple built by God Himself. To her, at the same time virgin and mother, who will feed us with the Logos, we must go, since she is the assembly of those whom God intends to save.[1] The Gnostic is set forth as the true priest and deacon of God: this dignity he has not received from the hands of men, nor does he sit on the president's chair, though, as a just man, he has his place in the ranks of the *presbyterium*.[2] Nay, the *Quis dives salvetur* supplies us with a classical text in behalf of St. Peter's primacy: this Apostle is "the Elect, the Chosen one, the first of the disciples (*ὁ πρῶτος τῶν μαθητῶν*), for whom alone, together with Himself the Saviour paid the tribute."[3]

Baptism is a new birth (*ἀναγέννησις*), that makes us God's children, perfect, immortal; an illumination (*φώτισμα*), a bath (*λουτρόν*) that washes away our sins and the punishments due to them.[4]

The Eucharist accompanies Baptism. Clement often alludes to it, though he seldom speaks of it in very clear terms. Always inclined to seek beyond the divine reality it contains, for the more intimate effects of which it is the symbol and agent, he obscures, in his speculations, statements which he had first made most explicitly. This is the case with the following passage: "The Word is all to the little child, father, mother, tutor and nurse: Eat my flesh, He says, and drink my blood. This is the suitable food the Lord gives us; He offers us His flesh and pours forth His blood unto us; and henceforth nothing is wanting for the children's growth. O wonderful mystery! He commands us to cast off our carnal corruption of old, as a disease that afflicted us in the past, to share in the new regimen of Christ, and by receiving Him, if possible, to place Him in ourselves and to hide the Saviour in our breast, that He may control the affections of our flesh. But perhaps you are unwilling to understand it thus: [perhaps you prefer to understand it] in a more common way. Hear also this." Then our author goes on to explain how, through Jesus Christ and by faith in Him, we enter into communion with the Father who sets Him before His own nurslings as milk and food.[1]

---

[1] *Strom.*, IV, 20, col. 1381; VII, 5, col. 437; *Paed.*, I, 6, col. 281, 300; III, 12, col. 677.

[2] *Strom.*, VI, 13, col. 328.

[3] *Quis dives salvetur*, 21, col. 625.

[4] *Paed.*, I, 6, col. 280, 281; *Strom.*, II, 13, col. 996.

Clement of Alexandria seems to understand Penance, somewhat like Hermas. After recording the words of the *Shepherd* on the only penance that can be done after Baptism, he endeavors to show it ought to suffice, and what a disorder it would be to repeat it often.[2] Of course, the official penance is the only one that is thus alluded to; for the chastisements with which God visits the Christian that falls into sin have for their purpose, he observes, to bring about his amendment.[3] We may remark also that the Church of Alexandria does not seem to have been, in Clement's time, as exacting as regards the reconciliation of murderers as the Church of Rome was at about the same time. This is inferred from the story of the young man converted by St. John, related by our author in the *Quis dives salvetur*, 42.

Did Clement ever compose the writing Περὶ ἀναστάσεως which he announced in his *Pedagogue* (I, 6, col. 305; II, 10, col. 521)? We do not know. This much, though, is beyond question: in those works of his that still remain, he teaches or implies the resurrection of the body.[4] As to the *millen-*

---

[1] *Paed.*, I, 6, col. 301; cf. *Paed.*, II, 2, col. 409, 412; *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, 13.

[2] *Strom.*, II, 13, col. 993, 996.

[3] *Strom.*, IV, 24, col. 1363.

[4] *Paed.*, I, 6, col. 284; I, 4, col. 260.

nium, he is completely silent. However, he admits that, after death, the souls of sinners will be sanctified (*ἁγιάζειν*) by an intelligent fire, and that the wicked will be likewise punished by fire.[1] Is their chastisement to last forever? Clement does not think so: those tortures of which he speaks in the seventh Stroma, 2 (col. 216), and which follow the final judgment bring the guilty to repentance. This same idea occurs again in the 12th chapter (col. 506); besides, in the 16th chapter (col. 541) the author lays down the principle that God does not punish, but only corrects, that is, that any punishment on His part is remedial.[2] When we remember that later on Origen started from the very same principle to infer the *apocatastasis*, we are probably right in believing that Clement understood this principle in the same way as his illustrious successor.

Anyhow, he adds that, for the elect, they shall be received into one of the three dwelling-places signified by the numbers thirty, sixty, a hundred, of the parable of the seed (*Matt.*, 13^8).[3] The Gnostic alone is allowed to enjoy what the eye has not seen, nor the ear heard, what has not entered into the heart of man to conceive. He will enter the house of God, there to contemplate Him in a light unchangeable and eternal.[4]

§ 2. — Origen.[5]

Of all the theologians of the East, Origen is undoubtedly the greatest and the one whose influence has been the deepest. A man of a knowledge truly universal, who possessed all the learning of his time, though he did not search all its various parts with the same thoroughness; a soul eminently upright and sincere; a bold mind, which, far from dissembling a difficulty, always looked straight at it, which knew how to doubt, and not to force its own opinion in the questions he thought open to debate; a mind capable of synthetic and general views, while his extensive knowledge of the details was marvellous, — he was, in the words of Bigg,[1] "the first great scholar, the first great preacher, the first great devotional writer, the first great commentator, the first great dogmatist" that the Church possessed. A great philosopher he was not. True, he was very well versed in the philosophical systems of antiquity and made use of them; nevertheless, in this regard, he was not personally an original thinker nor a creator.

---

[1] *Strom.*, VII, 6, col. 449; V, 14, col. 133.

[2] Cf. *Strom.*, VI, 14, col. 329, 332.

[3] *Strom.*, VI, 14, col. 337; IV, 18, col. 1321.

[4] *Strom.*, IV, 18, col. 1321; VII, 10, col. 481; VII, 11, col. 496.

[5] The edition quoted is that of Delarue-Lommatzsch, Berlin, 1831–1848. However, in case of texts more difficult to find, the volume and column of Migne's *Greek Patrology* (XI–XVII) have been noted, together with the volume and page of Lommatzsch. — Works: Huet, *Origeniana*, Rouen, 1668. E. R. Redepenning, *Origenes*, Bonn, 1841–1846. J. Denis, *De la Philosophie d'Origène*, Paris, 1884. C. Bigg, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, Oxford, 1886.

It is in the Περὶ ἀρχῶν, written in the years 228–231, that Origen endeavored to sum up and systematize all his doctrine; this book is, as it were, the first *Summa* ever composed in the Church. The author, discarding all controversies, intended to give us a synthesis of our beliefs: ". . . seriem quamdam et corpus ex horum omnium ratione perficere, ut manifestis et necessariis assertionibus de singulis quibusque quid sit in vero rimetur, et unum, ut diximus, corpus efficiat."[2]

L. Atzberger, *Geschichte der christlichen Eschatologie innerhalb der vornicänischen Zeit*, Friburg in Brisgau, 1896. W. Fairweather, *Origen and Greek Patristic Theology*, New York, 1901. F. Harrer, *Die Trinitätslehre des Kirchenlehrers Origenes*, Ratisbon, 1858. Knittel, *Des Origenes Lehre von der Menschwerdung des Sohnes Gottes*, in the *Theolog. Quartalschr.*, vol. 54, 1872. Ch. Boyer, *La Rêdemption dans Origène*, Montauban, 1886. M. Lang, *Ueber der Leiblichkeit des Vernunftwesen bei Origenes*, Leipsic, 1892. C. Klein, *Die Freiheitslehre des Origenes*, Strasburg, 1894. G. Capitaine, *De Origenis Ethica*, Munster in Westphalia, 1898. G. Anrich, *Klemens und Origenes als Begründer der Lehre von Fegfeuer*, Tübingen, 1902. G. Bordes, *L'Apologétique d'Origène d'après le Contra Celsum*, Cahors, 1900. P. Batiffol, *L'Eglise Naiss. et le Catholicisme*, p. 355–397.

[1] *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, p. 115.

[2] *De princip.*, I, Praef., 10. Except a few fragments preserved in Greek, we

Side by side with the *De principiis*, we must mention as chief sources of Origen's theology, his *Commentarii in Evangelium Joannis* (228–238), the *Contra Celsum* (249) and the *De Oratione* (233–234).

The basis of this theology, he tells us, is ecclesiastical preaching, the Creed as developed and explained by the Church; for the truth ought to be sought for in the very multiplicity of the views and errors that spring up on all sides.[1] What is this teaching of the Church? We find it exposed in the first book of the *De principiis* (Praef., 4–10). He distinguishes some doctrines that are certain and universally professed and taught, and others that are not set forth "manifesta praedicatione." Among the former, these are to be reckoned: one God, creator, author of the two Covenants, who is both just and kind; — Jesus Christ born of the Father before all creatures, and His minister in creation, Himself being God, who, while remaining God, was made man and became incarnate; who put on a body like ours and was born of the Virgin and of the Holy Ghost; who was truly born, truly suffered, died, rose again and ascended into Heaven; — the Holy Ghost, associated in honor and dignity with the Father and the Son, the inspirer of the Old and the New Testament (4). Then the soul, its immortality, the reward or the chastisement "igni aeterno" which it deserves after death according to its deeds; the resurrection of the body, man's freewill, the soul's struggle against the devil and his angels (5); hence the existence of

---

have unfortunately of the *De principiis* only a Latin translation made by Rufinus in the year 398, in which the latter strove to palliate the inaccuracies that were to be found in the original itself, chiefly as regards the Trinitarian doctrine. A literal Latin translation made by St. Jerome has almost completely perished.

[1] "Cum multi sint qui se putant sentire quae Christi sunt, et nonnulli eorum diversa a prioribus sentiant, servetur vero ecclesiastica praedicatio per successionis ordinem ab Apostolis tradita et usque ad praesens in ecclesiis permanens; illa sola credenda est veritas quae in nullo ab ecclesiastica et apostolica discordat traditione." (*De princip.*, I, Praef., 2.)

this devil and of his angels (6). To this must be added the creation of the world, its beginning in time, its future ruin (7); the inspiration of the Scriptures and their having two meanings, — one apparent and obvious, the other hidden and spiritual (8); in fine, the existence of the good Angels whose services God uses for the salvation of men (10). On the other hand, among the questions that are not fully cleared up, Origen mentions the following: Is the Holy Ghost begotten or not (St. Jerome translates "Is He *made* or not")? Is He also Son of God (4)? Does the soul come "ex seminis traduce" or otherwise (5)? Are the demons fallen Angels (6)? What was there before the present world and what shall there be after it has ceased to exist (7)? Are God and the spirits *ἀσώματα* and in what sense (8, 9)? When were Angels created, what are they and what is their state? Finally, have the stars a soul or not (10)?

This twofold enumeration is instructive and the distinction, made by Origen between the truths that are definitively ascertained and those that are still mooted is quite important. The former, he observes, are the truths the Apostles thought it was necessary openly to preach to all, "etiam his qui pigriores erga inquisitionem divinae scientiae videbantur"; the latter are those of which they have handed over the pursuit to the "studiosiores" "qui Spiritus dona excellentia mererentur et praecipue sermonis sapientiae et scientiae gratiam per Spiritum sanctum percepissent (I, Praef., 3)." Of certain things they have said "quia sint," — and this suffices for the ordinary faithful, — while they have left to those who are more earnest the task to find out "quomodo aut unde sint" (*ibid.*). This is the field where the sagacity of the theologian and of the exegete will exercise itself.

For the teaching of the Church must be justified and completed both by Scripture and by sound philosophy.[1] Holy

---

[1] *De princip.*, I, Praef., 10.

Scripture is the first source of Theology; and Holy Scripture is made up of all the words of Jesus Christ: not merely of those He uttered as man, but also of those He spoke as Word of God, through Moses and the Prophets.[1] In fact, Origen is eminently *the* theologian of Scripture: it is always Holy Writ he endeavors to explain, on which he rests and which he consults to get an answer to his questions; and we know what extensive works he undertook in regard to the sacred text.

This Holy Writ, he continues, contains three meanings, corresponding to the very constitution of man: a *somatic* or literal meaning, a psychical or moral meaning, a pneumatic or spiritual meaning. The first is the "communis et historialis intellectus": it suffices for the edification of the "simpliciores"; the second is for the edification of those who are progressing; finally, the third, " lex spiritualis," is for the edification of the perfect.[2] Sometimes these last two senses are not easily distinguished one from the other; nevertheless we can see in many cases and from the examples given by Origen that the psychical or moral sense is that which applies to the relations of the individual soul with God and the moral law; while the spiritual sense is more far reaching and applies to mysteries, to the universal Church and her history, to the future world and to Heaven.

Does it follow that all the passages of Scripture can be explained in this threefold meaning? No; there are especially some that cannot be understood in the literal meaning. God has, as it were, thrown them on our way, to remind us that the Sacred Books have a higher import. Passages of this kind are not found in the Old Testament alone, but also in the Gospels and Apostolic writings. Origen gives some examples; however, he denies that by this process he does away with the historical and literal sense of Holy Writ; for these cases, he adds, are evidently mere exceptions: "A nobis evidenter decernitur in quam plurimis servari et posse et oportere historiae veritatem." [1]

---

[1] *De princip.*, I, Praef., 1.

[2] *De princip.*, IV, 11; cf. *In Levitic.*, hom. V, 1, Lom., IX, 239; *P. G.*, XII, 447.

How did he justify this system of allegory? First of all, by the practical impossibility of understanding literally certain Biblical narratives; then by the authority and example of St. Paul.[2] The chief reason, though, that prompted him personally to adopt such a mode of interpretation was of a more universal nature, namely, that the whole visible creation is after all nothing but an immense symbol of the unseen world, and every individual, the representation of a suprasensible idea or fact.[3] Just as man was created in God's image, so also every being was created as the image of a higher reality. Unable to reach these realities, the mass of men must accept the symbols that bring it indirectly in relation with them, while the perfect Christian's privilege consists in piercing, as it were, through these images and in reaching the very mysteries they conceal.

This was indeed a lofty conception, yet fraught with great dangers: for it afforded room to depart from the letter of Holy Writ under the pretext of a deeper meaning; to maintain or reject, at one's will, its historical part; finally, to substitute one's fancy for the rule of faith.

The second source to which Origen had recourse to explain and make the Church's teaching fruitful, was philosophy, any kind of philosophy; for, like Clement, Origen threw aside only the systems that denied God and His Providence.[4] He held that philosophers had learned by revelation at least some of the lofty ideas they had expressed, that they often agree with the law of God,[1] and that the latter completes their affirmations. However he is less enthusiastic for them than Clement was: he quotes them more seldom and upbraids them with having fallen into many errors, tolerated idolatry, spoken only for an élite, and lacked the authority necessary to teach souls.[2] He seems to have realized the inefficacy of the attempts made before him to draw from Philosophy the confirmation and the explanation of dogmas; hence his efforts to imbue himself with its methods and spirit are greater than the attention he pays to its doctrines. It is in this that Origen is truly a philosopher, viz., by the turn of his mind, restless and inquiring, his liking for speculation, the boldness with which he dares to reason even in supernatural problems. Thus, too, we may account for Porphyry's judgment that Origen lived as a Christian, and thought as a Greek, and introduced the ideas of the Greeks into the myths of other nations.[3]

---

[1] *De princip.*, IV, 15–19.

[2] *De princip.*, IV, 13.

[3] *In Cantic. Canticor.* Lib. III, vers. 9, Lom., XV, 48; *P. G.*, XIII, 173, 174; *In Levit.*, hom. V, 1, Lom., IX, 239; *P. G.*, XII, 447.

[4] St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, *In Origen. oratio panegyr.*, 13, 14.

For it would be a real mistake to believe that Origen's dogmatic conclusions properly so called were seriously influenced by the particular philosophy he had studied. True, he had been, about the year 210, the pupil of Ammonius Saccas, who founded the Neo-Platonic school, and the fellow-student of Plotinus, the author of the *Enneades;* still our author is not truly a Neo-Platonist. All the surroundings in which he lived told on his mind more than a system bearing a particular name; and if Plato's philosophy, as understood at Alexandria in the beginning of the third century, left on him its impression, it is far more because he highly esteemed its tendencies and spirit than because he adopted its doctrines.[4]

---

[1] *Contra Cels.*, V, 3; *In Genes.*, hom. XIV, 3.

[2] *Contra Cels.*, V, 43; VII, 47; VI, 2; *In Genes.*, hom. XIV, 3; ST. GREGORY THAUMAT., *In Origen. orat. panegyr.*, 14.

[3] EUSEB., *Eccl. Hist.*, VI, 19, 7.

[4] HARNACK, *Lehrb. der D G.*, I, 781, ff.; *History of Dogma*, vol. II, pp. 332, ff. We must not forget that Neo-Platonism was systematized into a body of doc-

These are the principles that guided Origen in the exposition of his theology. We may see now how he applied them.

His God, like that of Clement, is the somewhat abstract God of Platonism. He is "*ἐπέκεινα τῆς οὐσίας*, ex omni parte *μονάς* et ut ita dicam *ἑνάς* . . . incomprehensibilis, inaestimabilis, impassibilis, *ἀπροσδεής*."[1] However, man can know Him naturally, and in proportion as he frees himself from subjection to matter.[2] Besides, this monad is *τριάς* or *trinitas;* it contains three hypostases: the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost.[3]

The second term of this trinity is the Word, the Son. It is worthy of remark that when Origen comes to speak of Him, he starts with the Incarnate Word, Jesus Christ, as set forth in the Symbol. His teaching may be summed up in three words: The Word is God and distinct from the Father; He is eternally begotten; nevertheless He is inferior to the Father; and thus his doctrine oscillates between the dogma of consubstantiality in which it logically issues, and subordinationism to which the problem of creation brings it back. This much, however, should be said in its behalf: it leaves no room whatever for Arianism strictly so called.

Let us remember, first of all, that Origen had known Modalism at Rome and never ceased to oppose it, by affirming the real distinction between the Son and the Father. There are some, he says, who regard the Father and the Son as not numerically distinct (*ἀριθμῷ*), but as one, *ἕν*, *οὐ μόνον οὐσίᾳ ἀλλὰ*

---

trine only later on, and that the *Enneades* of Plotinus, which may be regarded as its text-book, was published only in the year 269, sixteen years after the death of Origen.

[1] *Contra Cels.*, VI, 64; *In Joan.*, XIX, 1, Lomm., II, 149; *P. G.*, XIV, 536; *De princip.*, I, 1, 5, 6; II, 4, 4; III, 5, 2.

[2] *De princip.*, I, 1, 7.

[3] Ἡμεῖς μέντοι γε τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις πειθόμενοι τυγχάνειν, τὸν πατέρα, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα. *In Joan.*, II, 6 (Lomm., I, 109, 110; *P. G.*. XIV, 128); VI, 17 (Lomm., I, 227; *P. G.*, XIV, 257); *In Isaiam*, hom. I, 4; IV, 1.

καὶ, ὑποκειμένῳ, and as merely diverse *κατά τινας ἐπινοίας, οὐ κατὰ ὑπόστασιν.*[1] Origen taught, on the contrary, that *ἕτερος κατ' οὐσίαν καὶ ὑποκείμενον ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατρός*; that there are *δύο τῇ ὑποστάσει πράγματα.*[2] The reader will notice that our author sometimes confuses the terms *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις*, sometimes opposes one to the other: though he always gives to the latter a well-defined meaning which will ultimately triumph.

Thus really distinct from the Father, the Son is not created, but begotten, and from all eternity. This last feature is one that Origen sets forth most clearly: "Non enim dicimus, sicut haeretici putant, partem aliquam substantiae Dei in filium versam, aut ex nullis substantibus filium procreatum a patre, id est extra substantiam suam, ut fuerit aliquando quando non fuerit, sed, abscisso omni sensu corporeo, ex invisibili et incorporeo Verbum et sapientiam genitam dicimus absque ulla corporali passione, velut si voluntas procedat a mente."[3] And refuting Arius beforehand, he goes on to reaffirm that "non erat quando (Filius) non erat"; for the Son, he observes, is the brightness of the eternal light, and light necessarily shines always with brightness.[4]

How does this generation take place? Origen has just said it. The Son is not a part of the substance of the Father: when begetting His Son, He did not sever Him from Himself; for the Son is not a prolation (*προβολή*).[5] Nay, this generation is not an act that has a beginning and an end: it is an act eternal and continuous as the brightness of the light that always shines: still, time and eternity even are not to be mentioned, for the Trinity is above all this.[1]

---

[1] *In Joan.*, X, 21, Lomm. I, 350; *P. G.*, XIV, 376.

[2] *De Oratione*, 15; *Contra Cels.*, VIII, 12.

[3] *De princip.*, IV, 28.

[4] *In Epist. ad Rom.* I, 5, Lomm., VI, 22, 23; *P. G.*, XIV, 848, 849; *In Epist. ad Heb. fragm.*, Lomm., V, 297; *P. G.*, XIV, 1307.

[5] *De princip.*, IV, 28; *In Jerem.*, hom. IX, 4, Lomm., XV, 212; *P. G.*, XIII, 357; cf. *De princip.*, I, 2, 6; *In Joan.*, I, 23, Lomm., I, 50; *P. G.*, XIV, 65.

Thus begotten from the Father's substance, the Son is God, not because of an extrinsic participation (*κατὰ μετουσίαν*), but essentially: *κατ' οὐσίαν ἐστὶ θεός*:[2] He is of the Father's substance: He is *ὁμοούσιος* with Him. This word is found in Origen, if the following translation is correct: "Sic et sapientia ex Deo procedens ex ipsa Deo substantia generatur. Sic nihilominus et secundum similitudinem corporalis aporrhoeae esse dicitur aporrhoea gloriae omnipotentis pura et sincera. Quae utraeque similitudines manifestissime ostendunt communionem substantiae esse filio cum patre. Aporrhoea enim *ὁμοούσιος* videtur, id est unius substantiae cum illo corpore ex quo est vel aporrhoea vel vapor."[3] In this passage Origen absolutely discards Anomæanism. If we notice, moreover, that he sets aside likewise any sharing of the Father's substance and any *προβολή*, we may conclude that he admits a strict consubstantiality.

And still, Origen is frankly subordinationist. True, the Son is of the Father's substance; He possesses it, but less fully than the Father; it is, as it were, weakened, lessened in Him, since it is communicated and since, besides, the Son is the Father's instrument. Origen is led to this conclusion by his anxiety to uphold against the Modalists the distinction between the two persons, by the necessity to explain the Biblical texts that set forth the Son as inferior to the Father, and by the need he has of a mediator to account for the creation. His Word is that of Athanasius, and yet still preserves something of that of Philo. He is not *ὁ θεός* nor *αὐτοθεός*, but *θεός*, *δεύτερος θεός*. He is not, like the Father, *αὐτοαγαθόν*, *ἀπλῶς ἀγαθός*, *ἀπαραλλάκτως ἀγαθός*, but only *εἰκὼν ἀγατόθητος*:[1] He is not absolutely simple, but rather, holding the middle between the one and the complex. He contains the Father's ideas, the types of the beings that can be brought into reality (*σύστημα θεωρημάτων*):[2] He does not know the Father as well as He is known by Him, and the glory He receives from His Father is greater than the glory He procures to Him.[3] Likewise, His action is less widespread: it exercises itself only on rational beings (*ἐπὶ μόνα τὰ λογικά*).[4] In short, He is God, but under the Father (*θεὸν κατὰ τὸν τῶν ὅλων θεὸν καὶ πατέρα*).[5] — Hence we should not simply and absolutely address Him our prayers. We may offer Him our prayers, for He is God, but merely in order that, as our High Priest, He may present them to the Father.[6] Nay, some expressions still more objectionable, on which it is unnecessary to insist, may be found here and there.[7]

---

[1] *In Jerem.*, hom. IX, 4, Lomm., XV, 212; *P. G.*, XIII, 357; *De princip.*, IV, 28.

[2] *Selecta in Psalmos*, hom. XIII, 134. He is, like the Father, *αὐτοσοφία, αὐτοδικαιοσύνη, αὐτοαλήθεια, αὐτοβασιλεία* (*In Matth.*, XIV, 7; Lomm., III, 283; *P. G.*, XIII, 1197; cf. *In Joan.*, I, 27).

[3] *In Epist. ad Hebr. fragm.*, Lomm., V, 299, 100 and XXIV, 358, 359; *P. G.*, XIV, 1308.

As we said before, Origen placed among the questions that had not yet been decided by the teaching of the Church, the origin of the Holy Ghost, viz., His divinity: "Utrum (Spiritus Sanctus) natus an innatus (St. Jerome: factus an infectus), vel filius etiam Dei ipse habendus sit necne?"[8] Owing to the lack of Biblical and traditional data, he did not know what to think. In many places, indeed, he seems to affirm the divinity of the Holy Spirit, and, taking all in all, inclines obviously to this side: he complains that there are some people "minora quam dignum est de eius divinitate sentientes"; he adds that everything was made, barring the nature of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, and then, that nowhere is it stated that the Holy Spirit is "factura vel creatura"; that He is eternal and does not pass from ignorance to science; that He shares in the Father and the Son's honors and dignity, and that, like them, He is holy.[1] In fine St. Basil could bring forward our author as a witness of the Catholic doctrine against the Pneumatomachians.[2] However, now and then, he hesitates to draw conclusions. No doubt, it is pious to believe that the Holy Ghost was not created; and yet, he says, since everything was made by the Son, the Holy Ghost too must be His work: *εἰ πάντα διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐγένετο, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐγένετο, ἓν τῶν πάντων τυγχάνον.*[3]

---

[1] *Contra Cels.*, V, 39; *De princip.*, I, 2, 13; cf. *In Joan.*, VI, 23.

[2] *In Joan.*, II, 12; I, 22, Lomm., I, 41, 42; *P. G.*, XIV, 56.

[3] *De princip.*, IV, 35; *In Joan.*, XXXII, 18, Lomm., 473; *P. G.*, XIV, 821.

[4] *De princip.*, I, 3, 5; cf. I, 3, 8.

[5] *Contra Cels.*, II, 9; VI, 60.

[6] *Contra Cels.*, V, 4; VIII, 13, 26; *De orat.*, 14, 15.

[7] Κτίσας (*In Joan.*, I, 22, Lomm., I, 40; *P. G.*, XIV, 56); *πρεσβύτατον πάντων τῶν δημιουργημάτων* (*Contra Cels.*, V, 37).

[8] *De princip.*, I, Praef., 4.

In any case, the Holy Spirit is inferior to the Son (*ὑποδεεέστερον τοῦ δι' οὗ ἐγένετο*).[4] On this point, Origen is most positive. The sphere of His action is more limited than that of the Son. The Father's action extends to all beings, the Son's to all rational creatures, and the Holy Ghost's only to the just: *ἔτι δὲ ἧττον τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπὶ μόνους τοὺς ἁγίους διϊκνούμενον.*[5]

After all, the Trinity is then conceived by Origen in a descending order, which, though maintaining the unity of nature in the divine persons, still determines, as it were, the exact degree of its fulness in each one of them. This is an error which he was to hand down to many other scholars and of which Greek Theology did not rid itself without much difficulty. But even though he did not altogether correct — for he did lessen it — this defective feature of the Apologists' Trinitarian teaching, still at least he set aside unhesitatingly its second defective element, viz., the theory of the Son's temporal generation. Here Origen clearly anticipates the Nicene definition. Some have tried to decrease his merit, by observing that, as he admitted the creation *ab aeterno,* he was bound to admit also the eternal generation of the Logos. This is true; however, between these two eternities, that of the creatures and that of the Son, Origen sets a very great difference: "Haec enim sola Trinitas est quae omnem sensum intelligentiae non solum temporalis verum etiam aeternalis excedit. Caetera vero quae sunt extra Trinitatem in saeculis et in temporibus metienda sunt." Again: "Sempiternum vel aeternum proprie dicitur quod neque initium ut esset habuit, neque cessare unquam potest esse quod est. Hoc autem designatur apud Joannem cum dicit quoniam Deus lux est. Splendor autem lucis eius sapientia sua est, non solum secundum quod lux est, sed et secundum quod sempiterna lux est, ita ut aeternus et aeternitatis splendor sit sapientia sua. Quod si integre intelligatur, manifeste declarat quia subsistentia Filii ab ipso Patre descendit, sed non temporaliter neque ab ullo alio initio, nisi, ut diximus, ab ipso Deo."[1]

---

[1] *De princip.*, I, praef., 4; I, 3, 3; I, 3, 4; II, 2, 1; II, 7, 3; IV, 28; V, 35; *In Isaiam*, hom. IV, 1.

[2] St. Basil (*De Spiritu Sancto*, XXIX, 73) quotes *In Joan.*, VI, 17, Lomm., I, 227; *P. G.*, XIV, 257.

[3] *In Joan.*, II, 6, Lomm., I, 113, 110; *P. G.*, XIV, 132.

[4] *In Joan.*, II, 6, Lomm., I, 113; *P. G.*, XIV, 132.

[5] *De princip.*, I, 3, 5; cf. I, 3, 8.

As we have just said, Origen admitted the creation *ab aeterno.* This is one of the charges brought against him, and one that is justified. The eternity of the divine omnipotence seemed to him incompatible with the hypothesis of a duration when nothing but God would have existed, for omnipotence can be conceived only on condition that it effectively exercises itself on real beings.[2] Hence there must have always existed some creatures. Which then? Spirits before all others (*νοῦς*); but not pure spirits, otherwise they could not have been joined to ethereal and subtile bodies. For, though he betrays some hesitation, our author does not believe that, outside the Trinity, there can exist a spirit altogether free from matter and incorporeal.[1]

---

[1] *De princip.*, I, 2, 11; IV, 28; cf. II, 9, 2.

[2] *De princip.*, I, 2, 10; cf. III, 5, 3, 4.

All these spirits were created equal in powers and gifts, and free. Here we reach one of Origen's most daring conceptions. He had been struck by the diversity of physical and moral conditions, of talents and qualities, to be noticed in the world; and, instead of appealing, to explain this phenomenon, to the free will of God, he seeks that explanation in the freedom of creatures. All spirits had been created equal; however, as they were free, all were not equally faithful to God. Hence arose the differences we see among rational beings. Their fall, their *καταβολή*, is the real cause of the present condition of the universe.[2] For among these spirits, some became the Angels, the heavenly powers, with their hierarchy, their degrees, their functions proportioned to their merit; others, clothing themselves with luminous matter, became the sun, the moon and the stars; others too, growing cool because of their departure from God, became the souls of men (*ψυχή*, from *ψύχω*, to cool); others finally became devils, with their bodies more subtile than those of men, more heavy than those of Angels.[3] But, just as the actual working of free will has modified God's original plan and brought about the present state of things, so also can it change this order again, nay indefinitely. By doing good or evil, spirits can climb up or go down the scale of beings; by their virtuous lives, human souls can win back the more spiritual condition from which they fell; and, in the main, a new world can begin after the present world is over.[4]

---

[1] *De princip.*, I, 6, 11; II, 2, 1, 2; IV, 35, St. Jerome's translation.

[2] *De princip.*, I, 9, 6; II, 9, 5, 6; III, 5, 4.

[3] *De princip.*, I, 8, 1, 2, 4; II, 8, 3 (St. Jerome's translation); II, 1, 1–4; I, Praef., 8; III, 5, 4; *Contra Cels.*, I, 32, 33; *In Joan.*, I, 17.

[4] *De princip.*, II, 8, 3; III, 6, 3 (St. Jerome's translation); cf. *Contra Cels.*, IV, 69.

Evil, then, was brought into this world by the free will of creatures; and though the presence of evil does not do away with the harmony of the cosmos, and is no argument against the goodness of God who can draw good out of it, yet evil does exist.[1] One sin or even several sins were committed by the spirits and by the human souls before the actual state of things. Is this original sin? We will see presently that Origen assigns it to another time: though we may remark, for the time being, that he is most positive as to the fact that all men, even the child one day old, are sinners. He appeals to the text of Job, 14$^{4, 5}$, in the Septuagint,: *Τίς γὰρ καθαρὸς ἔσται ἀπὸ ῥύπου, ἀλλ' οὐθεὶς, ἐὰν καὶ μία ἡμέρα ὁ βίος αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, and thus accounts for the baptism of children, "pro remissione peccatorum," "secundum ecclesiae observantiam."[2] When there is question as to what this blemish consists in, and whence it arises, then his hesitation begins. In his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (5^{9}), Origen seems to make original sin consist in the fault committed by the souls before their descent upon earth, when they were still spirits, but elsewhere, in fact in most places, he inclines towards another hypothesis. He observes that the word *ῥύπος* of the Book of Job designates not a sin properly so called, but a stain in general: "neque enim id ipsum significant sordes atque peccata."[3] Now it is certain that, by the mere fact of its being united to a body, and in this very union, every soul contracts a blemish: "Quaecumque anima in carne nascitur iniquitatis et peccati sorde polluitur."[4] Every child then, when being born, is marked with this stain, and Origen feels inclined to regard this original sin. Moreover, whence does it come to pass that the flesh thus stains the soul united with it? Perhaps our author intends to answer this question when he remarks that, as Adam begot his first child only after his sin, our body is by itself a body of sin; and also that, as all men were contained in Adam dwelling in Eden, all were, with him and in him (cum ipso et in ipso) expelled from the earthly paradise, that is, all undergo the consequences of Adam's sin.[1] If such is the case, Origen sets forth an almost satisfactory theory of original sin: at any rate, he supplies its elements, though he does not bring them sufficiently together nor combine them closely enough.

---

[1] *De princip.*, II, 9, 6; *Contra Cels.*, IV, 70, 54; *In Numeros*, hom. XIV, 2.

[2] *In Matth.*, X, 23; *In Levit.*, VIII, 3 (Lomm., IX, 318; *P. G.*, XII, 496); *In Epist. ad Rom.*, V, 9 (Lomm., VI, 397); *P. G.*, XIV, 1043, 1044; *In Lucam*, hom. XIV (Lomm., V, 135; *P. G.*, XIII, 1834).

[3] *In Lucam*, hom. XIV, Lomm., V, 134; *P. G.*, XIII, 1834.

[4] *In Levit.*, VIII, 3; *In Lucam*, hom. XIV, Lomm., V, 134; *P. G.*, XIII, 1834; *Contra Cels.*, VII, 50.

Again, as the native stain is a universal fact, we are obliged to admit as a universal fact also that man follows his evil inclinations and commits evil daily: *πρὸς τὸ ἀμαρτάνειν πεφύκαμεν.*[2] Under the influence of concupiscence, bad example and the devil, sin takes deep root, multiplies, and permeates everything in us.[3]

Jesus Christ came into this world to expiate this sin. His soul, created from the beginning with the other spirits, alone remained absolutely faithful to God, and, united to the Logos at first by its free choice, it saw this union become a second nature and acquire an immovable stability, in virtue of a long habit of practising good.[4] To save us, the Logos, thus joined to the soul, united Himself, through the soul's intermediary,[5] to a body, to one which was beautiful and perfect, since every soul has the body it deserves, befitting the part which the soul is destined to fulfil.[6] Jesus is born of a virgin; His birth is real; He assumes our weaknesses, our infirmities, our passibility; and He takes our legitimate passions, and all that belongs to the rational soul.[1] Docetism, as well as Apollinarianism, which is still to come, are discarded by Origen, although he retains some insignificant traces of the former that probably came to him from the Gnostics.[2]

---

[1] *In Rom.*, V, 9 (Lomm., VI, 397; *P. G.*, XIV, 1047); V, 1 (Lomm., VI, 326; *P. G.*, XIV, 1009, 1010).

[2] *Contra Cels.*, III, 66; III, 62; *In Roman.*, I, 1, Lomm., VI, 14; *P. G.*, XIV, 840.

[3] *De princip.*, III, 2, 2; *Contra Cels.*, III, 69.

[4] *De princip.*, II, 6, 5, 6.

[5] *De princip.*, II, 6, 3.

[6] *Contra Cels.*, VI, 75–77; I, 32, 33.

Jesus Christ then, is and remains truly man in the Incarnation; on the other hand, in the same mystery, the Word too does not change, nor lose anything of what He was: *τῇ οὐσίᾳ μένων* λόγος:[3] it follows that in the Saviour there are two natures: He is God and man, "Deus Homo:" "Aliud est in Christo deitatis eius natura, quod est unigenitus filius Patris, et alia humana natura quam in novissimis temporibus pro dispensatione suscepit."[4] Yet, though there are two natures, there is only one being: "For the Word of God, chiefly after the dispensation, became one (*ἕν*) with the soul and body of Jesus." Jesus is *σύνθετόν τι χρῆμα*.[5] In his attempts to state this union with as much precision as possible, Origen compares it to the union of the iron and of the fire in the red hot iron, and he adds, besides, that the body and the soul are not merely associated with the Word (*κοινωνίᾳ*) but are joined to it by a union and a mixture (*ἑνώσει καὶ ἀνακράσει*), which have made them share in the divinity and transformed them into God (*εἰς θεὸν μεταβεβηκέναι*).[6] No doubt, these expressions are beyond the mark and ought to be corrected by what we have said above: yet they show the idea which the author forms and endeavors to express, of the unity in Jesus Christ. He expresses it also by the communication of idioms, which he not only uses, but of which also he is the first to state the law with precision, and to show the grounds in the hypostatic union.[1]

---

[1] *Contra Cels.*, I, 34, 35, 37, 69; II, 69; III, 25; II, 23; I, 66; II, 9; *De princip.*, IV, 31.

[2] *Contra Cels.*, VI, 77; II, 64, 65; cf. III, 41, 48.

[3] *Contra Cels.*, IV, 15; VII, 17; VIII, 42; *In Joan.*, XXVIII, 14, Lomm., II, 354; *P. G.*, XIV, 720.

[4] *De princip.*, I, 2, 1; II, 6, 2, 3; *Contra Cels.*, VII, 17.

[5] *Contra Cels.*, II, 9; I, 66.

[6] *Contra Cels.*, III, 41; *De princip.*, II, 6, 6.

However, if we must interpret in a favorable way the great Doctor's texts on the transformation of Jesus Christ's humanity during His mortal life, it seems that we cannot do the same for those which refer to His glorious life. According to him, not only the body of Jesus becomes more subtile after the Resurrection,[2] but the humanity seems even to vanish away altogether and melt, as it were, into the divinity: "Tunc homo fuit, nunc autem homo esse cessavit." As the latter, the former becomes immense and present everywhere: "Ipse (Jesus) tamen ubique est et universa percurrit. Nec ultra intelligamus eum in ea exiguitate in qua nobis propter nos effectus est." [3]

Origen studied the work of Christ upon earth, under nearly all its aspects, and he had the opportunity, in his extensive commentaries, to set forth all its results. Jesus Christ is our lawgiver, the Moses of the New Law: He appeared as the teacher of the just, the physician of sinners, a pattern of the perfect life, whose imitation leads us to a share in the divine life; [4] He appeared, however, chiefly as our redeemer and the victim for our sins.

Origen conceived in a twofold way the liberating act of Jesus Christ. In several passages, he sees in it a redemption, a repurchase properly socalled. By sin we have been delivered over to the devil, we have been made his slaves, in the ancient meaning of the word, his property. To redeem us,

---

[1] *De princip.*, II, 6, 3; IV, 31.

[2] *Contra Cels.*, II, 62; cf. 64–66.

[3] *In Luc.*, hom. XXIX (Lomm., V, 197; *P. G.*, XIII, 1875; consult, however, Delarue's note on this passage); *In Jerem.*, hom. XV, 6 (Lomm., XV, 28; *P. G.*, XIII, 436); *In Joan.*, XXXII, 17 (Lomm., II, 463; *P. G.*, XIV, 813); *De princip.*, II, 11, 6.

[4] *Contra Cels.*, III, 7; IV, 22, 32; II, 52, 75; III, 62; I, 68; VIII, 17, 56; *De princip.*, IV, 31.

Jesus Christ gives up to Satan His own life and soul, Himself our ransom, the price He pays for us (*ἀντάλλαγμα*): "To whom did Jesus surrender His soul as a ransom for many? Assuredly not to God. Is it not then to the evil [spirit]? For the latter was our master until he received our ransom, viz., the soul of Jesus." [1] — Then, side by side and parallel with this, our author develops the theory of the *substitutio vicaria* and of the propitiatory sacrifice. Jesus Christ substituted Himself for us: He is our moral leader who took on Himself our sins: "Peccata generis humani imposuit super caput suum; ipse (Jesus) est enim caput corporis ecclesiae suae." [2] Thus bearing our sins, He suffered for us freely and because He was willing to do so.[3] A true priest, He offered to His Father a real sacrifice of propitiation of which He Himself is the victim: "quo scilicet per hostiam sui corporis propitium hominibus faceret Deum . . . secundum hoc ergo quod hostia est, profusione sanguinis sui propitiatio efficitur in eo quod dat remissionem praecedentium delictorum." [4] In this way God and the devil received what was due to them, respectively.

This redemption of Jesus was universal; not only all men, until the end of the world, find in Him their Saviour, but His power extends beyond the limits of this earth; it reaches all reasonable beings that need to be redeemed: *οὐ μόνον ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων* ('Ιησοῦς) *ἀπέθανεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν λοιπῶν λογικῶν.*[5]

---

[1] *In Matth.*, XVI, 8 (Lomm., IV, 27; *P. G.*, XIII, 1397); XII, 28; *Contra Cels.*, I, 31; *In Rom.*, IV, 11 (Lomm., VI, 308; *P. G.*, XIV, 1000); *In Exod.*, VI, 9 (Lomm., IX, 68; *P. G.*, XII, 306); *Exhort. ad martyr.*, 12; *Contra Cels.*, VIII, 27, 54, 64.

[2] *In Levit.*, hom. I, 3; *In Joan.*, XXVIII, 14, Lomm., II, 355; *P. G.*, XIV, 720, 721.

[3] *Contra Cels.*, I, 54; II, 44; VII, 57.

[4] *In Epist. ad Rom.*, III, 8, Lomm., VI, 205, 213; *P. G.*, XIV, 946, 950; cf. *In Numeros*, hom. XXIV, 1, Lomm., X, 292, 293, ff.; *P. G.*, XII, 756, 757.

[5] *In Joan.*, I, 40, Lomm., I, 79; *P. G.*, XIV, 93; *In Matth.*, XIII, 8, Lomm., III, 227; *P. G.*, XIII, 1116; *De princip.*, III, 5, 6; *Contra Cels.*, VII, 17.

It depends on man's free will to profit by the redemption brought to us by Jesus. We have seen how strongly Origen affirms the existence of that liberty and how he makes it responsible even for our present state. Sin has not done away with it: freely we go to God, freely we are lost. Not indeed that in our good works we can do without the divine help; on the contrary, grace is their necessary principle; however, all depends on us, as all depends on grace: God and man must work together. To express this necessary union, the great Doctor has found the definitive formulas, which we might believe the products of a later age: "E duobus unus effici debet intellectus, id est, ut neque quae in nostro arbitrio sunt putemus sine adiutorio Dei effici posse, neque ea quae in manu Dei sunt putemus absque nostris actibus et studiis et proposito consummari." [1]

Thus faith itself comes from God (δυνάμει τινὶ θείᾳ); besides, to be genuine, it must be accompanied by good works and the practice of the virtues it inspires. On this condition alone it justifies us.[2] And yet, even then, faith is for Origen only the lowest degree of Christian life. Above faith there is science (γνῶσις), since "according to our teaching also, it is far better to be convinced of our dogmas by reason and science than by mere faith." [3] On this point Clement's disciple has taken over his master's doctrine. Like him, though with less insistence, he divides the Christians into two categories, and, like him, introduces a rigid ascetical and moral element into the concept of the true Gnostic: the latter is expected to practise continence and virginity, retirement and separation from the world.[1]

---

[1] *De princip.*, III, 1, 22. And also: "Non sufficit ad perficiendam salutem sola voluntas humana, nec idoneus est mortalis cursus ad consequenda caelestia, et ad capiendam palmam supremae vocationis Dei in Christo Jesu, nisi haec ipsa voluntas nostra bona, promptumque propositum et quaecumque illa in nobis esse potest industria divino vel iuvetur vel muniatur auxilio . . . Ita etiam nostra perfectio non quidem nobis cessantibus et otiosis efficitur, nec tamen consummatio eius nobis, sed Deo, qui est prima et praecipua causa operis adscribetur" (*De princip.*, III, 1, 18).

[2] *Contra Cels.*, VIII, 43; III, 69, 71, 72; *In Joan.*, XIX, 6, Lomm., II, 190; *P. G.*, XIV, 569; *In Levit.*, II, 4; XII, 3; Lomm., IX, 389; *P. G.*, XII, 662.

[3] *Contra Cels.*, I, 13; *In Matth.*, XII, 15, Lomm., III, 158, 159; *P. G.*, XIII,

However, as we have seen, Origen shows on every occasion preoccupations which are, so to speak, more *ecclesiastical* than those of Clement, and this is why his informations in regard to practical Christianity and worship are more abundant and precise. The Church, he tells us, is the city of God.[2] Outside of her, no salvation is possible.[3] Baptism washes away all sins;[4] and since little children themselves are sinners, the Church imparts Baptism to them, in keeping with Apostolic tradition.[5] Still, martyrdom, which is the Baptism of blood may replace it, nay, is superior to the Baptism of water.[6]

But the baptized Christian may fall back into sin: what remedies has he still at his disposal? Origen enumerates six remedies that can cure him: martyrdom, alms, forgiveness for the wrongs he has endured, zeal for the conversion of sinners, love of God and finally penance.[7] His doctrine on this last point is interesting to study. Penance requires first of all the acknowledgment of the fault: "Vide ergo quid edocet nos Scriptura divina, quia oportet peccatum non celare intrinsecus." [8] This acknowledgment ought to be made to the bishop, to the ministers of the Church: "Cum non erubescit (peccator) sacerdoti Domini indicare peccatum suum et quaerere medicinam." [9]

---

[1] *Contra Cels.*, I, 26; VII, 48; VIII, 55; *In Levit.*, XI, 1.

[2] *Contra Cels.*, III, 30.

[3] "Nemo se decipiat: extra hanc domum, id est, extra Ecclesiam nemo salvatur. Nam si quis foris exierit, mortis suae ipse fit reus." (*In libr. Jesu Nave*, hom. III, 5, Lomm., XI, 34; *P. G.*, XII, 841, 842).

[4] *In Joan.*, VI, 17, Lomm., I, 227; *P. G.*, XIV, 257; *In Matth.*, XV, 23, etc.

[5] *In Rom.*, V, 9, Lomm., VI, 397; *P. G.*, XIV, 1047; *In Lucam*, hom. XIV, Lomm., V, 135; *P. G.*, XIII, 1835; *In Levit.*, VIII, 3, Lomm., IX, 318; *P. G.*, XII, 496.

[6] *Exhort. ad martyr.*, 30, 34, 50.

[7] *In Levit.*, II, 4, Lomm., IX, 191; *P. G.*, XII, 418.

[8] *In Psalm.* XXXVII, hom. II, 6, Lomm., XII, 266, 267; *P. G.*, XII, 1386.

[9] *In Levit.*, II, 4, Lomm., IX, 192, 193; *P. G.*, XII, 418.

"Consequens enim est ut . . . etiam ministri et sacerdotes ecclesiae peccata populi accipiant, et ipsi, imitantes magistrum, remissionem peccatorum populo tribuant."[1] To these "ministers and priests" it belongs to judge whether or not public penance should be done — "qui (languor) in conventu totius ecclesiae exponi debeat et curari,"[2] — and to forgive sin; — a function which belongs to all of them, but to the bishop in a special manner: "Israelita, si peccet, id est laicus, ipse suum non potest auferre peccatum: sed requirit levitam, indiget sacerdote, imo potius et adhuc horum aliquid eminentius quaerit: pontifice opus est, ut peccatorum remissionem possit accipere."[3]

The question is merely to know whether all sins can be forgiven, and whether the official penance can be granted indiscriminately and several times for all kinds of sins. To this question we find the following answer, formulated in the great Doctor's writings, as they have come down to us. We ought to distinguish between ordinary mortal sins (*culpae mortales*) and the "*crimina mortalia*" (πρὸς θάνατον), viz., idolatry, adultery, fornication and voluntary murder.[4] As to the former, one can always do penance for them and obtain pardon: "Ista vero communia (crimina) quae frequenter incurrimus semper paenitentiam recipiunt and sine intermissione redimuntur."[5] As regards the latter, in his *De oratione*, 28, written about the years 233–234, Origen wonders that some claim presumptuously the right to condone them:[1] a right which surpasses the priestly dignity. This incapability of being remitted is upheld in regard to *apostasy* in the *Series of the Commentaries on St. Matthew*,[2] 114, which were written after the year 244, although Origen asks himself whether apostates cannot at times plead a certain ignorance as an excuse. However, we see that, several years before the year 244, the 11th and the 15th Homily on Leviticus concede that penance can be done once — but only once — for the *graviora crimina:* "In gravioribus enim criminibus semel tantum paenitentiae conceditur locus."[3] "Quod et si aliquis est qui forte praeventus est in huiuscemodi peccatis, admonitus nunc verbo Dei, ad auxilium confugiat paenitentiae, ut si semel admisit secundo non faciat, aut si et secundo aut etiam tertio praeventus est, ultra non addat."[4] How can we account for this contradiction? If we remember that it occurs chiefly between a work of which the Greek text is in our hands — the *De oratione* — and works of which we have only the Latin translation, the most likely explanation is that the Latin translator of the fourth century modified in his translation the teaching of the original texts in order to make it agree with the discipline of his own time. Origen, as well as Tertullian, regarded the *crimina mortalia* as beyond forgiveness: but he has been corrected in this point, as in many others.

---

[1] *In Levit.*, V, 3, Lomm., IX, 246; *P. G.*, XII, 451.

[2] *In Psalm.* XXXVII, hom. II, 6, Lomm., XII, 267; *P. G.*, XII, 1386.

[3] *In Numeros*, hom. X, 1, Lomm., X, 92; *P. G.*, XII, 635, and above. However, in the *De oratione*, 28 (Lomm., XVII, 240; *P. G.*, XI, 528), Origen seems to ascribe to the spiritual man (πνευματικός) the power to remit sins. Cf. *In Levit.*, V, 12, Lomm., IX, 268, 269; *P. G.*, XII, 464.

[4] *In Levit.*, XV, 2, Lomm., IX, 424, 425; *P. G.*, XII, 560, 561; *De oratione*, 28, Lomm., XVII, 241, 243; *P. G.*, XI, 528, 529.

[5] *In Levit.*, XV, 2, Lomm., IX, 245; *P. G.*, XII, 561.

Our author's Eucharistic doctrine is not less interesting than his doctrine on Penance, and presents to us, though with more emphasis, the two tendencies we have already noticed in the teaching of Clement of Alexandria: — one that holds before us the naked, common and literal truth of the real presence; the other that shows to us in the consecrated elements the symbols of more recondite and exclusively spiritual realities.

---

[1] Lomm., XVII, 241, 243; *P. G.*, XI, 528, 529.

[2] Lomm., V, 17, 18; *P. G.*, XIII, 1763.

[3] *In Levit.*, XV, 2, Lomm., IX, 424, 425; *P. G.*, XII, 561. The homilies on Leviticus are probably anterior to the year 244.

[4] *In Levit.*, XI, 2, Lomm., IX, 380, 381; *P. G.*, XII, 533.

For on one hand, Christians, giving thanks to the Creator, eat "the loaves that have become through prayer a body (*σῶμα*), a body holy and making holy those who use it with a right intention." [1] When the faithful receive this "body of the Lord," they hold it with the greatest care and respect, lest some parcel of it should fall. They would consider themselves guilty — and in this they are right — if by their own neglect, something of it should be lost. Origen observes that they do not take so much pains in preserving the word of God.[2] This is the more common, the more simple belief in regard to the Eucharist: *κοινοτέραν περὶ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ἐκδοχήν.*[3] The great Doctor does not disown it: not at all; but he adds his own commentary. After seeing in the Eucharist the Lord's body, he sees in it moreover the symbols of the teaching of Jesus Christ, which also is truly our bread: "Possumus vero et aliter intelligere. Omnis sermo Dei panis est, sed est differentia in panibus." [4] So much so, that now and then he forgets the reality contained in the mystery, and writes that, when setting before us the bread and wine as His body and blood, Jesus did not mean to designate the material bread and wine, but the Word in whose mystery this bread was to be broken and this chalice to be shed. For what else can both the body and blood of the Word-God be, than the speech (word) that feeds, the speech (word) that brings gladness to the heart? [5]

---

[1] *Contra Cels.*, VIII, 34.

[2] *In Exod.*, hom. XIII, 3, Lomm., IX, 156; *P. G.*, XII, 391.

[3] *In Joan.*, XXXII, 16, Lomm., II, 459; *P. G.*, XIV, 809.

[4] *In Exod.*, XIII, 3, 5, Lomm., IX, 402, 403, 409; *P. G.*, XII, 547, 550; *In Levit.*, VII, 5, Lomm., IX, 305, 306; *P. G.*, XII, 486, 487; *In Numeros*, hom. XXIII, 6; *In Matth.*, XI, 14, Lomm., III, 106, 107; *P. G.*, XIII, 498, foll.

[5] *In Matth. Commentariorum series*, 85, Lomm., IV, 416, 417; *P. G.*, XIII, 1734, 1735: "Panis iste quem Deus Verbum corpus suum esse fatetur verbum est nutritorium animarum . . . et potus iste quem Deus Verbum sanguinem suum fatetur verbum est potans et inebrians . . . Non enim panem illum visi-

Nevertheless our author regards the Eucharistic sacrifice as a true sacrifice, and speaks of Christian altars as not overflowing with the blood of animals, but as consecrated by the precious blood of Jesus Christ: "pretioso sanguine Christi consecrari." [1]

We have still to treat of Origen's eschatology. This is one of the parts of his doctrine, as all know, for which he has been most criticized and his memory most charged with anathemas; hence the need to study it closely.

For Origen, the future life is nothing else than "the everlasting Gospel," viz., the full revelation, the full light.[2] The just are the first for whom such a life is destined. However, when they die, they do not generally go straight to Heaven. They repair to Paradise, that is, to a subterranean place, "in quodam eruditionis loco," where their purification is perfected by means of a bapitsm of fire.[3] Though all come to this baptism, all do not suffer equally therefrom, and if there were some who should have nothing to expiate, and were perfect, they would pass through it without suffering.[4] Thus baptized, the just rise from sphere to sphere, always becoming purer and more enlightened as regards the secrets of nature and the mysteries of God, until they are united to Christ.[5]

Origen condemns Millenarianism and sets aside metem-

---

bilem, quem tenebat in manibus, corpus suum dicebat Deus Verbum, sed verbum in cuius mysterio fuerat panis ille frangendus. Nec potum illum visibilem sanguinem suum dicebat, sed verbum in cuius mysterio potus ille fuerat effundendus. Nam corpus Dei Verbi aut sanguis quid aliud esse potest nisi verbum quod nutrit et verbum quod laetificat cor?"

[1] *In Librum Jesu Nave,* II, 1; VIII, 6; X, 3; *In Judices,* III, 2, Lomm., XI, 237; *P. G.*, XII, 962, 963.

[2] *De princip.*, IV, 25; *In Rom.*, I, 4, Lomm., VI, 20; *P. G.*, XIV, 847.

[3] *De princip.*, II, 11, 6; *In Luc.*, hom. XXIV.

[4] *In Psalm.* XXXVI, hom. III, 1, Lomm., XII, 181, 182; *In Levit.*, IX, 8; *In Luc.*, hom. XIV, Lomm., V, 136. It need scarcely be said that this doctrine is, at bottom, the very doctrine of Purgatory.

[5] *De princip.*, II, 11, 6, 7.

psychosis.[1] In a passage of the *De principiis*, he seems to doubt whether or not the elect in Heaven will have bodies.[2] However, elsewhere and most of the time, he teaches the resurrection of the body. For there is in our bodies, he observes, an *insita ratio*, a reproductive germ which will develop in death, and give rise to a new body, the resuscitated body, no longer animal and corruptible, but incorruptible and spiritual.[3] Though this new body has in common with the former nothing, as we see, except the germ whence it develops, yet, according to our author, it will be the same as the former.[4] Moreover, it will be endowed with qualities that will vary according to the deserts of each individual.[5]

As to the wicked, they will undergo the chastisement of fire, though not a fire prepared beforehand and common to all. The fire that will eat them up will be fitted for each one of them and arise from their very sins, from the remorse they will feel for them, much the same as the fire of fever arises from the bad humors accumulated in the organism.[6] — Shall these torments be everlasting? An important question on which Origen now and then hesitates to give his opinion.[7] In the *De principiis*, I, 6, 3, he dares not affirm that all the wicked angels shall, sooner or later, come back to God; again, in his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, he writes that, unlike the Jews, Lucifer shall not be converted, even at the end of time.[8] But, with these exceptions, in his works, as a general rule, Origen teaches the *ἀποκατάστασις*, the final restoration of all intelligent creatures to God's friendship. True, all shall not enjoy the same degree of happiness — there are various mansions in the Father's house,[1] — but all shall get a share of it. The Scriptures, he observes, far from opposing this view,[2] on the contrary uphold it.[3] If sometimes they seem to set forth the chastisement of the wicked as everlasting, it is to frighten sinners, to bring them back to the right path; and with some attention, we can find out the true meaning of the Biblical texts.[4] Then also, we must lay down as a principle that God chastises only to correct, and that, in His greatest wrath, He intends nothing but the amendment of the guilty. Like the physician who uses iron and fire to cure inveterate diseases, God uses the fire of hell to cure the unrepentant sinner: "Ex quo utique intelligitur quod furor vindictae Dei ad purgationem proficit animarum. . . . Ea poena quae per ignem inferni dicitur pro adiutorio intelligitur adhiberi." [5] All souls of men and other intelligent beings, that have left the path of righteousness, sooner or later will become again God's friends. True, for some this change will demand a long time, a very long time: yet, a time shall come when God is to be all in all. The last enemy, Death, shall be done away with; the body, made spiritual; the material world, transformed, and there will be in the universe nothing but peace and concord.[6]

---

[1] *De princip.*, II, 11, 2, 3; *Contra Cels.*, VIII, 30; *In Rom.*, V, 1, Lomm., VI, 336; *P. G.*, XIV, 1010.

[2] *De princip.*, III, 6, 1, St. Jerome's translation; cf. II, 3, 7.

[3] *De princip.*, II, 10, 3; III, 6, 4.

[4] *De princip.*, III, 6, 6.

[5] *De princip.*, II, 10, 3.

[6] *De princip.*, II, 10, 4.

[7] *In Joan.*, XXVIII, 7, Lomm., II, 325, 326; *P. G.*, XIV, 697; *In Jerem.*, hom. XVIII, 15, Lomm., XV, 353, 354; *P. G.*, XIII, 497, 500.

[8] Lomm., VII, 247; *P. G.*, XIV, 1185.

---

[1] *In Librum Jesu Nave*, XXV, 4; *In Numeros*, XXI, 1; *In Luc.*, hom. III; hom. XVII, Lomm., V, 151; *P. G.*, XIII, 1847; *In Levit.*, hom. XIV, 3, Lomm., IX, 415; *P. G .*, 555; *In Matth.*, X, 3.

[2] *In Exod.*, hom. VI, 13; *De princip.*, II, 3, 5. Origen thought that the expression "in saecula saeculorum" might designate a limited duration.

[3] The list of the Biblical texts appealed to by Origen may be found in Huet, *Origeniana*, lib. II, qu. 11, number 20 (Lomm., XXIII, 203, ff.; *P. G.*, XVII, 1030) and in Bigg, *The Christian Platonists*, p. 230, note 1.

[4] *Contra Cels.*, V, 15; cf. VI, 72.

[5] *De princip.*, II, 10, 6; *Contra Cels.*, V, 15.

[6] "In hunc ergo statum omnem hanc nostram substantiam corporalem putandum est perducendam, tunc cum omnia restituentur ut unum sint, et cum

Shall this state at least be definitive, and the free will of creatures rest in it forever from its turmoils? Logically, since the exercise of this free will still remains, such is not the case: a falling off is still possible. This is the charge brought by St. Jerome against Origen's system:[1] — a charge based on a text of the *De principiis*, in which the latter represents human souls as capable of passing on indefinitely from good to evil and from evil to good.[2] However, Origen affirms elsewhere that, by the will of God, the will of creatures will be fixed in the good, and that this last state shall not be changed: "In quo statu etiam permanere semper et immutabiliter Creatoris voluntate est credendum, fidem rei faciente sententia apostoli dicentis: Domum habemus non manu factam aeternam in caelis." [3]

Such is, in brief, Origen's theological system. Built on excellent premises, within the limits of which, however, its author's powerful mind did not keep itself, it presents, together with deep and correct views, some rash conjectures and unacceptable assertions. It resembles an overflowing river which rolls in its abundant waters at the same time the alluvium which brings fruitfulness and the sand which renders the ground sterile. But whether productive of good or of evil, the great Alexandrian Doctor's influence was felt, in a direct or

---

Deus fuerit omnia in omnibus. Quod tamen non ad subitum fieri, sed paulatim et per partes intelligendum est, infinitis et immensis labentibus saeculis, cum sensim et per singulos emendatio fuerit et correctio prosecuta, praecurrentibus aliis, et velociori cursu ad summa tendentibus, aliis vero proximo quoque spatio insequentibus, tum deinde aliis longe posterius, et sic per multos et innumeros ordines proficientium, ac Deo se ex inimicis reconciliantium, pervenitur usque ad novissimum inimicum qui dicitur mors ut etiam ipse destruatur, nec ultra sit inimicus. Cum ergo restitutae fuerint omnes rationabiles animae in huiusmodi statum, tunc natura etiam huius corporis nostri in spiritualis corporis gloriam perducetur" (*De princip.*, III, 6, 6; I, 6, 4).

[1] *Epist. ad Avitum*, 3 (*P. L.*, XXII, 1061).

[2] *De princip.*, III, 1, 21; III, 6, 3, St. Jerome's translation.

[3] *De princip.*, III, 6, 6.

indirect way, by almost all the theologians of olden times until St. Augustine in the West, and even till a later period in the East; they accepted his principles, and often did nothing but develop his ideas; nay, those who opposed him, used the very arms with which he supplied them. As it suffices to compare his doctrinal synthesis with that of Irenæus to realize the advance he shows in regard to his predecessor, so also it would suffice to compare it with the syntheses — and these merely partial — that were attempted afterwards, to realize how much they owe to it. Athanasius and the Cappadocians found in Origen proofs in behalf of *consubstantiality;* the Eusebians too found in his works proofs in behalf of subordinationism. Apollinaris was refuted beforehand by the great scholar's emphatic assertion of a free soul in Jesus Christ. On the other hand, Greek Theology never defined so strictly as Latin Theology did, the theory of the Redeemer's satisfaction, which Origen had neglected. His views on the preëxistence of souls, the spirituality of the resurrected bodies, and the *apocatastasis* raised in later times conflicts from which his memory has suffered; and yet, at the end of the fourth century, these views were very near getting the upper hand. Thus, received or discussed, condemned or followed, Origen has remained the true founder of scientific Theology. The Eastern Church has never produced a bolder theological explorer or rather pioneer, nor a more stimulating sower of ideas.

CHAPTER VIII

THE CHRISTOLOGICAL AND TRINITARIAN CONTROVERSIES IN THE WEST AT THE END OF THE SECOND AND AT THE BEGINNING OF THE THIRD CENTURY

Christianity considered the unity of God a fundamental dogma, and its doctors had to lay stress on this doctrine against the more or less explicit dualism of Gnosis. On the other hand, it admitted as equally certain the divinity of Jesus Christ. There seemed to be a contradiction between these two beliefs, — a contradiction which could not fail to attract soon the attention of Theologians. How could they reconcile the faith in one only God with the faith of the Redeemer's divinity? How confess one only God, if the Word, which, according to St. Justin's emphatic statement, was *ἕτερος ἀριθμῷ* in regard to the Father, is also God?

This difficulty had been soon noticed, and, as we have seen, the Apologists had endeavored to solve it by remarking that the presence of the divine nature in the Son is the result, not of a division, but of a communication and distribution. Other doctors, mentioned by St. Justin (*Dial.*, 128), had adopted a different solution. They taught that the Word was merely a power (*δύναμις*) of God, inseparable from the latter, as light is from the sun; that God, according to His will,[1] held out of or drew to Himself this power, which received various names: angel, glory, man, logos, according to the shape it assumed or the functions considered in it. Were these doctors Christians, or were they, as Otto thinks,[1] Alexandrian Jews? We cannot say. Anyhow, St Justin sets aside their explanation, as placing between the Father and the Word only a nominal distinction; and one cannot help being struck with the analogy it offers with some Sabellian systems of the fourth century. However, the very same explanation was taken up again, less than fifty years after St. Justin, this time, in reaction against another error which had preceded it: — the denial of the divinity of Jesus Christ.

---

[1] *Δύναμιν αὐτοῦ προπηδᾶν ποιεῖ, καὶ, ὅταν βούληται, πάλιν ἀναστέλλει εἰς αὐτόν.*

In regard to this subject, there has been in Ecclesiastical History and especially in the history of Dogma, a confusion which we must clear away in a few words.

Some have thought that these two errors, the denial of the divinity of Jesus and Patripassianism or Modalism, had, both, arisen from the desire to preserve the divine unity or *monarchy*,[2] and to both the name of Monarchianism has been given. Then, to distinguish them, the former has been styled *dynamic* Monarchianism, because it admitted, as present in Jesus Christ, only the power, the grace (*δύναμις*), and not the very essence (*οὐσία*) of God; while the latter was called *patripassian*, because it ascribed to God in general, or especially to the Father, the sufferings of Jesus Christ. Now, the second of these appellations is historically correct and acknowledged by those who lived when the doctrine arose. On the other hand, they never thought of giving the name of monarchianism to the heresy of Theodotus and Artemon; above all — and this is more important, — we read nowhere that Theodotus and Artemon were led to deny Christ's divinity, by the desire to preserve the divine unity and *monarchy*. True, this strict monarchy resulted from their system; but the latter did not arise from the former, and therefore to designate it by the name of Monarchianism, does not seem quite appropriate.[1] Harnack has suggested to designate it *Adoptianism.* This is the doctrine which makes Jesus Christ, not the Son by nature, but the adopted Son of God, by grace. We believe this appellation is more correct and we will use it in our studies.[2]

---

[1] Note 4, *ad loc. cit.*

[2] Novatian seems to confirm this view (*De Trinitate*, 30).

§ 1. — Adoptianism.

Adoptianism appeared successively in two centres distant one from the other: in Rome, at the end of the second century, and in Antioch, about the years 260–270. These two manifestations are connected by the name of Artemon, and besides, the latter of them has joined, by the place where it arose, Adoptianism with Arianism. We shall speak later on of Adoptianism at Antioch, and treat in this paragraph exclusively of Roman Adoptianism.

Its first author was a wealthy currier of Byzantium, named Theodotus,[3] who had received a fine education and was a well-read man. Having denied his faith during a persecution, he came to Rome to hide his shame; but there he was found out and, in order to clear himself, pleaded as an excuse that, after all, in denying Jesus Christ, he had not denied God, but only a man.[4] Being urged to explain what he meant, he developed his doctrine and endeavored to rest it on Biblical texts of which St. Epiphanius has left us the list and the commentary. This doctrine is most simple, and we find it recorded substantially in the same way by our various sources. According to the *Philosophoumena* (VII, 35), Theodotus admitted the teaching of the Church as regards creation. But Jesus, he thought, was a mere man, born of a Virgin, who had lived more religiously (*εὐσεβέστατον*) than His fellowmen. At His baptism in the Jordan, the *Christ* had come down upon Him under the form of a dove, and imparted to Him the powers (*δύναμεις*) He needed to fulfil His mission. This is why, before that time, no miracles are mentioned in His life. That descent of the Christ, who is thus identified with the Holy Ghost, had not made Jesus God, absolutely speaking: though, according to some Theodotians, He had become such after His resurrection.

---

[1] The heresy of Theodotus is not a Trinitarian, but a Christological heresy, and thus differs from that of Noetus.

[2] True, it has the drawback of designating already a Spanish heresy of the eighth century: but the confusion can be easily avoided, and, since a distinction has to be made, the present distinction, at any rate, will bear on an exact term.

[3] Special sources: *Philosophoumena,* VII, 35; X, 23; IX, 3, 12; X, 27. The treatise against Artemon, quoted by Eusebius, *H. E.,* V, 28. St. Hippolytus, *Contra Noetum,* 3, 4. Philastrius, 50. St. Epiphanius, *Haer.* LIV. Pseudo-Tertullian, 2.

[4] *Θεὸν ἐγὼ οὐκ ἠρνησάμην, ἀλλὰ ἄνθρωπον ἠρνησάμην* (St. Epiphan., *Haer.* LIV, 1).

About the year 190, Theodotus was excommunicated by Pope Victor. Nevertheless, he succeeded in keeping up his party, nay in organizing at Rome a schismatic community. As it was recruited from a narrow circle of literary and learned men, it resembled more a school than a Church. Studies were quite in honor among them, but with a marked rationalistic and positivist tendency, — though this comes, it must be confessed, from adversaries. Euclid, Aristotle, Theophrastus, Galen, — logicians, geometers, physicians — were the favorite authors. The method drawn from their works was then applied to the explanation of Holy Writ. The heretics cared little about interpreting the latter in harmony with the tradition and teaching of the Church: but they did care much about settling accurately the Biblical text and restoring the copies of Holy Writ to the primitive correctness: a point in which they did not always come to an understanding. Their exegesis was exclusively grammatical and literal: it amounted merely to the conjunctive and disjunctive syllogisms that could be drawn from this or that passage.

The treatise against Artemon, where we find these details, mentions particularly, among the Theodotians that excelled in these exercises, Asclepias or Asclepiodotus, Hermophilus and Apollonius, to whom we must join probably a certain Natalius, who was, for some time under Zephyrinus, the episcopal leader of the schism. Still, of all the followers of the currier, the best known is another Theodotus, called the banker, who founded the special sect of the Melchizedekians.[1]

He shared his master's erroneous opinion as to the person of Jesus; and besides, he added strange speculations in regard to to Melchizedek. The latter was greater than Jesus: he was the greatest power (*δύναμίν τινα μεγίστην*), "the heavenly power of the chief grace," the mediator between God and the Angels, and also, as St. Epiphanius relates (*Haer.* LV, 8), between God and us (*εἰσαγωγέα*), spiritual and Son of God (*πνευματικὸς καὶ υἱὸς θεοῦ*). This is why we should present our offerings to him, that he may, in his turn, present them for us, and that, through him, we may obtain life. — It is difficult to say what was the exact bearing of these expressions. Still, we may observe that the older Theodotus seems to have identified the Christ with the Holy Ghost; on the other hand, we see here Melchizedek called — no doubt in allusion to the *Epistle to the Hebrews* (7^3) — Son of God. Now, St. Epiphanius (*Haer.* LV, 5, 7) tells us that, a few years later, Melchizedek was identified by an Egyptian, Hieracas, with the Holy Ghost, and by some Christians with the Son of God who they thought had appeared to Abraham. Here then we find strange misconceptions which it suffices to point out.

The last representative of Western Adoptianism was Artemon or Artemas. All that is known about him is drawn from the treatise against his system, quoted by Eusebius (*H.*

---

[1] Special sources: *Philosophoumena*, VII, 36; X, 24. The treatise against Artemon, in EUSEBIUS, *H. E.*, V, XXVIII. PSEUDO-TERTULLIAN, 24. PHILASTRIUS, 52. ST. EPIPHANIUS, *Haer.* LV.

E., V, 28). Probably he taught at Rome about the year 235, or even later, and is set forth by the third Council of Antioch, held in the years 266–269, as the doctrinal ancestor of Paul of Samosata, and moreover, as still living at that time (*H. E.*, VII, 30, 16, 17). His relations with the Theodotian school are rather obscure. Theodotus had been condemned by Pope Victor about the year 190. But Artemon claimed that his own doctrine had been held by the Roman Church until Zephyrinus began to rule (202–218). How could he have made such an assertion, had he been the mere continuator and echo of Theodotus? There was probably, then, at least some slight difference between the two schools: but we do not know in what it consisted. All that we know is that Artemon too denied the divinity of Jesus Christ.

§ 2. — Patripassian Monarchianism.[1]

The Adoptianist error, after all, caused but little disturbance in the West; it had to face a belief which was held too strongly to be seriously shaken. Such was not the case with Patripassianism. The struggle to which it gave rise was momentous, both on account of the conspicuous men who took part in it, and because of the grave interests at stake. Besides, it spread as far as the East, and raised there also important disputes, as we shall see later on.

According to Tertullian, Praxeas is the first that brought the Patripassian error to Rome, or rather to Africa. What Praxeas was, we do not know at all; nay, some scholars (De Rossi, Hagemann) have asked themselves if he was not to be identified with Epigonus or Callistus. A more probable supposition is that, after having come to Rome under Eleutherus or Victor (about 180–200), and enlightened Zephyrinus on the true character of Montanism, he had passed over to Africa: there he developed his doctrine and was confronted by Tertullian who convicted him of heresy and made him sign a retraction. Thus we may understand why his name is unknown both to St. Hippolytus and to the *Philosophoumena*.

---

[1] Sources: TERTULLIAN, *Adversus Praxean.* ST. HIPPOLYTUS, *Contra Noetum. Philosophoumena*, IX, 7–12; X, 27. PSEUDO-TERTULLIAN, 25. ST. EPIPHANIUS, *Haer.* LVII, LXII. PHILASTRIUS, 53, 54.

As a matter of fact, St. Hippolytus points out Noetus as the first abettor of Monarchianism, and Smyrna, as its cradle. Twice sent for by the *presbyterium* of that city, to account for his scandalous utterances, Noetus confessed them finally and was excommunicated. Then he opened a school which soon began to propagate his views. These events must be placed between the years 180 and 200.

Epigonus brought to Rome the Patripassian doctrine under Zephyrinus or a little earlier (about 200–210). There he formed an independent party and found in Cleomenes a zealous disciple and valuable coworker. The latter became the leader of the sect and remained such until the name and person of Sabellius prevailed in it. At that time, the heresy reached its apogee, and the controversy was most intense. All that was heard, Tertullian says,[1] was the voice of people talking of *monarchy:* "Monarchiam, inquiunt, tenemus!" This disturbed considerably the Christian community.

What was then that monarchy preached by the innovators and what solution did they bring to the Trinitarian problem?

We possess three almost identical expositions of Monarchianism: those of St. Hippolytus, the *Philosophoumena* and Tertullian. The heretics are set forth as moved — St. Hippolytus says it most explicitly[2] — not only by the desire of safeguarding the divine unity, but also — and this explains partly their success — by the purpose of upholding the full divinity of Jesus Christ. Unfortunately they attain that purpose by giving up the personal distinction of the Father and of the Son and representing them as the two aspects of one same person.

---

[1] *Adv. Praxean*, 3.

[2] *Contra Noetum*, 1, 9.

This last point constitutes the fundamental article of the system: "Duos unum volunt esse ut idem pater et filius habeatur." [1] The Word does not exist by Himself: He is nothing but another name of the Father, a *flatus vocis*, "vox et sonus oris . . . aer offensus . . . caeterum nescio quid;" [2] St. John's first chapter is a mere allegory: Ἰωάννης μὲν γὰρ λέγει λόγον, ἀλλ' ἄλλως ἀλληγορεῖ.[3] In reality, it is the Father who came down into the Virgin's bosom, was born, and, by being born, became Son, His own Son, proceeding from Himself.[4] He it is who suffered and died (patripassianism); who raised Himself from the dead,[5] thus presenting attributes apparently contradictory, according as we consider Him in this or that state: unseen and seen, unknowable and knowable, uncreated and created, everlasting and mortal, unbegotten and begotten.[6]

Thus understood, the theory is most simple. Yet, when confronted with the texts that state the real distinction of the Father and of the Son, the Modalists could not help endeavoring to explain them while preserving at the same time the substance of their own teaching. This they did by declaring that in Jesus Christ, the flesh, the man, Jesus, is the Son, while the Divine element joined to the flesh, the Christ is the Father: "ut aeque in una persona utrumque distinguant patrem et filium, dicentes filium carnem esse, id est hominem, id est

---

[1] *Adv. Praxean*, 5; *Philosoph.*, IX, 10.

[2] *Adv. Praxean*, 7.

[3] *Contra Noetum*, 15.

[4] *Philosoph.*, X, 10; X, 27; *Adv. Praxean*, 10: "Ipse se sibi filium fecit;" 11; cf. 1, 2.

[5] *Contra Noetum*, 1, 3; *Philosoph.*, IX, 10; *Adv. Praxean*, 1: "Ipsum dicit patrem . . . passum;" 2: "Post tempus pater natus et pater passus;" 13.

[6] *Philosoph.*, IX, 10; *Adv. Praxean*, 14, 15.

Jesum, patrem autem spiritum, id est deum, id est Christum."[1] Hence the following formula which grated so much on Tertullian: "Filius sic quidem patitur, pater vero compatitur."[2]

Such is the Patripassian or Modalistic error taught in Rome by the Monarchians during the first quarter of the third century. Until the discovery of the *Philosophoumena*, scholars thought that Sabellius himself had lived later, and that his system differed somewhat from the one we have just exposed. This is not the case. The author of the *Philosophoumena*, who knew him and had met him often, makes him a contemporary of Zephyrinus and Callistus, and does not speak of any disagreement between his teaching and that of Cleomenes. But, as the Sabellian sect held its ground in the Church until the middle of the fifth century, some changes gradually took place which brought the doctrine to a more complex and learned form. It is under this form that Sabellianism is set forth in the refutations of it that were made in the fourth century, in reference to the case of Marcellus of Ancyra, by Eusebius, St. Athanasius and St. Hilary. Though it is not the primitive form, still it is manifestly derived from it.

The system itself which is well exposed by Mgr. Duchesne,[3] will come again under our consideration.

§ 3. — Opposition to Monarchianism.[4]

Patripassian Monarchianism had to face, in Rome, a twofold opposition: an intellectual opposition on the part of a school, and an official opposition on the part of ecclesiastical authorities. On one hand, doctors who showed a tendency quite contrary to that of the heresy, such as Tertullian, St. Hippolytus, the author of the *Philosophoumena*, refuted with vigor and success Praxeas, Epigonus, Cleomenes, Sabellius; on the other hand, Popes Zephyrinus and Callistus intervened in the dispute, to condemn definitively the new error.

---

[1] *Adv. Praxean*, 27; *Philos.*, IX, 12 (pp. 442, 443).

[2] *Adv. Prax.*, 29.

[3] *Origines Chrétiennes*, chapt. XVIII, p. 282; cf. *Hist. anc. de l'Eglise*, vol. I, pp. 310–311 [*Early Hist. of the Church*, pp. 225–227].

[4] The works bearing on this question will be mentioned, when we speak of St. Hippolytus and the *Philosophoumena*.

To give in this place a detailed account of the doctrine and argument opposed by the above-mentioned doctors to the Patripassians would be to encroach beforehand on the exposition we shall make, a few pages below, of their teaching.[1] We may remark, though, that, from a Trinitarian standpoint, this teaching reproduced and scarcely improved on that of the Apologists. The Word was fully distinguished from the Father and became other in regard to Him, and Son, only at the time of creation. At this particular moment, the distinction increased, and the Son apparently became inferior and subordinate to the Father. Temporal generation and subordinationism were the two shortcomings of the doctrine, otherwise correct, which the school called Trinitarian opposed to the affirmations of its Monarchian antagonist. To refute the error of the latter, St. Hippolytus and his followers no doubt inclined to the contrary error.

As to the opposition made to Monarchianism by the Church authorities, it deserves to be carefully studied.

According to some of our documents, this opposition really never existed, and the bishops of Rome: Victor, Zephyrinus, and Callistus favored, nay professed heresy.

This is insinuated, as to Pope Victor, by Tertullian (*Adv. Prax.*, 1), and plainly affirmed by the author of the list of heresies to be found at the end of the treatise *De praescriptione*, — the Pseudo-Tertullian, as he is commonly called: "Sed post hos (haereticos) omnes etiam Praxeas quidam haeresim introduxit, quam Victorinus corroborare curavit" (25). It would be out of place to examine at length this accusation: Tertullian's words are rather vague; and then the charge in the catalogue comes from an anonymous writer; besides, if the reading *Victorinus* is correct, it does not designate Victor, and if it is an alteration, it may designate Zephyrinus.[1] The *Philosophoumena* does not address any reproach to Victor, and we may easily understand that, after receiving from Praxeas a useful advice in the affair of Montanism, this Pope at first gave him tokens of kindness and did not rebuke him for a heresy which he developed probably only later on. On these various grounds we may put aside the name and memory of Victor from the dispute which we are going to expose.

---

[1] Cf. the following chapter.

As to Zephyrinus and Callistus, the charges of the *Philosophoumena* are specific. The former, it says, favored heresy. He allowed first the Christian community to go to hear the innovators; and then he himself professed their doctrine: "'I know only one God,' he said, 'Jesus Christ, and beside Him none other, who was born and who suffered.' And he added: 'It is not the Father who died, but the Son,' which caused among the people continual disputes." [2]

For Callistus, after giving of his previous life an account at least somewhat biased, the author of the *Philosophoumena* represents him, on his being made the deacon of Zephyrinus, passing from one side to the other, apparently sharing the views of everybody, but in reality favorable to the error, misdirecting particularly Sabellius, whom he gradually brought back to Cleomenes, and treating as ditheists the champions of orthodoxy.[3]

---

[1] Cf. Oehler's note in his edition of Tertullian, II, p. 265.

[2] *Philosoph.*, IX, 11: Ἐγὼ οἶδα ἕνα θεὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ πλὴν αὐτοῦ ἕτερον οὐδένα γεννητὸν καὶ παθήτον. Ποτὲ δὲ λέγων· οὐχ ὁ πατὴρ ἀπέθανεν, ἀλλὰ ὁ υἱός, οὕτως ἄπαυστον τὴν στάσιν ἐν τῷ λαῷ διετήρησεν.

[3] *Philosoph.*, IX, 11, 12; St. Hipp., *Contra Noet.*, 14; Tertullian, *Adv. Prax.*, 3: "Duos et tres (deos) iam iactitant a nobis praedicari."

Meanwhile, the same author continues,[1] Zephyrinus died (217) and was replaced by Callistus. Opposed by powerful adversaries, closely watched, and more conspicuous than ever, the new Pope realized that he had to break with the Patripassians, and he condemned Sabellius. But he was not sincere and, as Sabellius beset him with reproaches, he devised a modification of his former error. Then follows the exposition of that altered Monarchianism a short sketch of which has been already given,[2] and which Mgr. Duchesne reduces to the following points:[3] "(1) Outside the Incarnation, the difference between the Father and the Son is merely nominal. (2) The Incarnation is the reason of the real difference: in Jesus Christ, the Son is the visible and human element; the Father, the invisible and divine element. (3) The union of these two elements, though so close that we may affirm that they form only one being, is not so close that we may affirm that the Father, viz., the divine element, suffered; He merely sympathized with the Son."

These accusations against Zephyrinus and Callistus rest, let it be observed, on the exclusive authority of the *Philosophoumena*, and the antipope, the author of this work, had strong reasons to dislike both Zephyrinus who had exalted Callistus, and especially Callistus who was regarded as the lawful Pope. Besides, the formulas with which the former is reproached are too little explicit to be qualified with anything like accuracy: taken in themselves, they are orthodox, and the second rejects formally Patripassianism.[4]

As to Callistus, two things are certain: he treated of ditheists the followers of the Trinitarian school and he condemned Sabellius: but he only rebuked the former and showed them the ultimate term of the tendency — a tendency which explains why at first he turned Sabellius away from them; — while, afterwards, he explicitly condemned the latter. Did he do so by mere policy and did he really uphold the system ascribed to him by the *Philosophoumena?* It is quite strange that Tertullian, who disliked Callistus and who addresses him many reproaches, does not charge him with such a misdeed. The witness of the author of the *Philosophoumena* is isolated and moreover is that of a personal enemy. It is confirmed by no vestige of any modalistic teaching whatever, that might have remained in the Roman doctrine of that time. This being the case, it cannot be accepted as the expression of simple and genuine truth. Until further historical researches are made, Callistus must at present, to judge exclusively by the facts, be regarded as orthodox.

---

[1] IX, 11, 12.

[2] Cf. above, pp. 292–293.

[3] *Origines Chrétiennes*, p. 286. Cf. also *Hist. anc. de l'Eglise*, vol. I, p. 314 [*Early Hist. of the Church*, p. 228].

[4] We should remark that, as a matter of fact, the *Philosophoumena* does not charge Zephyrinus with upholding Monarchianism in its modified form: this modification was made only later on.

After its condemnation, Monarchianism does not seem to have counted many followers in Rome and in the West. However, St. Epiphanius (*Haer.* LXII, 1) tells us that there were Sabellians at Rome in his time, and Marangoni discovered, in the year 1742, near the *cubiculum* of St. Callistus, an inscription which apparently indicated that, in the fourth century or earlier, there was in the same spot a burial-ground for the heretics.[1] On the other hand Commodian's poems contain several verses of a decided modalistic tendency. But these few facts are mere exceptions to a general situation. It is chiefly in the East and in Egypt that Sabellianism continued to subsist.

---

[1] The inscription in mosaic, accompanied by the Constantinian monogram, stood near a painting representing Christ between St. Peter and St. Paul. It read: *Qui et filius diceris et pater inveniris.* This inscription is lost and there is no reproduction of it.

CHAPTER IX

THE FOUNDERS OF LATIN THEOLOGY — ST. HIPPOLYTUS, TERTULLIAN, NOVATIAN

§ 1. — St. Hippolytus.[1] The Philosophoumena.

While in the East Theology soared to wonderful heights in the works of Clement of Alexandria and Origen, it was worked out also in the West in writings of less expansion and of a more limited horizon, yet composed in a remarkably strong and fixed language. As we have seen, St. Irenæus had given to that Theology its doctrinal foundation and, as it were, the spirit with which it was to be inspired: in the period of which we are going to treat, Tertullian fixed its formulas and Novatian wrote its first textbook.

As to St. Hippolytus, he is known chiefly as an exegete. His commentaries on Holy Writ were the first that the Church ever read, and they have deserved to be preferred to those of

---

[1] The edition quoted for the *Contra Noetum* is that of Fabricius in *P. G.*, X; for the other works, those of G. N. Bonwetsch and H. Achelis in the *Die griechischen Schriftsteller*, Leipsic, 1897. — Works: C. J. Bunsen, *Hippolytus and his Age*, London, 1852, 2nd edit., 1854. C. Wordsworth, *St. Hippolytus and the Church of Rome in the early part of the third century*, London, 1853, 2nd edit., 1880. J. Döllinger, *Hippolytus und Kallistus*, Ratisbon, 1853; English translation, by A. Plummer, Edinburgh, 1876. L. Atzberger, *Geschichte der christlichen Eschatologie innerhalb der vornicänischen Zeit*, Friburg in Brisgau, 1896, pp. 271–290. G. N. Bonwetsch, *Studien zu den Kommentaren Hippolyts zum Buch Daniel und Hohenliede*, Leipsic, 1897. H. Achelis, *Hippolytstudien*, Leipsic, 1897. J. Sjoholm, *Hippolytus och modalismen*, Lund, 1899. P. Flournoy, *Searchlight of St. Hippolytus*, London, 1900. K. J. Neumann, *Hippolytus von Rom in seiner Stellung zu Staat und Welt*, Leipsic, 1902.

Origen, not indeed for genius and learning, but for the soundness of the principles of exegesis which inspired their composition. Viewed as a theologian, he can be judged only imperfectly. Most of his didactic and polemical writings are lost. Written in Greek, they exercised no influence on the formation of the Latin theological language. But in their substance and method, they marked a real progress in the development of Christian thought. They place their author half-way, as it were, between St. Irenæus and Tertullian. Less precise and vigorous than the latter, he seems to be more progressive and less subservient to the letter than the Bishop of Lyons.

It is in his controversy with the Modalists and after refuting their errors, that St. Hippolytus exposes his own thoughts on the relations of the Father and the Son in the Trinity, and this he does chiefly in the 10th and 11th chapters of his treatise against Noetus. In the beginning, he tells us, the Father was alone; however, though being alone, He was manifold (*μόνος ὢν πολὺς ἦν*), for He was not without word and wisdom (*οὔτε γὰρ ἄλογος οὔτε ἄσοφος*). When then He would create the world, He caused His Word to appear (*ἔδειξε τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ*); He brought It outside, that It might be the instrument (*ἐργάτην*) of creation. This production is a generation (*γεννῶν*); in what it consists exactly, the author is unable to explain; nevertheless, he strongly maintains its existence: the Word is not created, but begotten.[1]

Thus, he continues, there was some one other than the Father (*καὶ οὕτως παρίστατο αὐτῷ ἕτερος*): although we cannot speak of two Gods, for the Word is "a light produced by a light, a stream of water welling up from a spring, a ray bursting from the sun. . . . The Word is the intelligence (*νοῦς*) which, appearing in the world, manifested itself as Son of God."[2]

The Word, begotten by God, is His Son; yet, according to

---

[1] *Contra Noetum*, 10; cf. 16.

[2] *Contra Noetum*, 11; cf. 10.

St. Hippolytus, this sonship becomes perfect only through the Incarnation. For, although he sets forth the Word as *μονογενής*, he declares that, when God called Him His Son, it was by prolepsis, and because the Word was to become such one day (. . . *τὸν λόγον ὅν υἱὸν προσηγόρευε διὰ τὸ μέλλειν αὐτὸν γενέσθαι*): "Without the flesh and considered apart, by Himself, the Word was not fully Son, though, as *μονογενής*, He was fully Word."[1]

We need not insist to show that the previous exposition contains the Trinitarian system of the Apologists, and particularly the doctrine of the temporal generation of the Logos. The latter, first insufficiently distinct from the Father, proceeds from Him at a determined moment — viz., when the Father wishes it, — to be the immediate agent of creation; still, He proceeds from Him by way of generation and by communication of the divine substance.

There are but few traces of Subordinationism in St. Hippolytus.[2] On the other hand, some scholars (Duchesne, Harnack) have charged him with not having regarded the Holy Spirit as a person strictly so called. For he reckons in God *πρόσωπα δύο, οἰκονομίᾳ δὲ τρίτην τὴν χάριν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*.[3] The Holy Ghost, then, is not for Him a *πρόσωπον*. — True, our author does not give Him explicitly this name: but we must remember that the object of the controversy between Trinitarians and Modalists was merely the nature of the distinction between the Father and the Son: the Holy Spirit did not come into the dispute, and the need was not yet felt to state with precision the Christian doctrine in reference to Him. Hence St. Hippolytus contented himself with speaking of Him as a third numerical term whose presence completed the trinity (*τριάς*).[1] Besides, he ascribes to Him the divine nature just as he does to the Father and to the Son.[2]

---

[1] *Contra Noet.*, 15: Οὔτε γὰρ ἄσαρκος καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ὁ λόγος τέλειος ἦν υἱὸς, καίτοι τέλειος λόγος ὤν, μονογενής.

[2] *Contra Noet.*, 6, 14.

[3] *Contra Noet.*, 14.

Meanwhile, the Word, at first *ἄσαρκος*, became for us a true man, assuming a rational soul (*ψυχὴν ἀνθρωπίνην, λογικὴν δὲ λέγω*), and also our infirmities and passions.[3] This incarnation did not consist in a transformation of the Word into the man (*οὐ κατὰ τροπήν*); the duality of the divine and human elements is emphatically maintained,[4] but their union is close (*συγκεράσας, μίξας*): the same person is both God and man; [5] in Jesus Christ, the flesh could not subsist apart, in itself, since it subsisted in the Word.[6] The 18th chapter of the *Contra Noetum* offers us a precise summary of this doctrine on the unity of person and the duality of natures in the Redeemer.

The Word became thus incarnate to save us all, to set us free through His obedience.[7] A disciple of St. Irenæus, St. Hippolytus sees in the Incarnation the very beginning of our regeneration. Jesus Christ is the new man: [8] He reshaped, in His own person, the old Adam (*ἀναπλάσσων δι' ἑαυτοῦ τὸν 'Αδάμ*).[9] However, our doctor is not ignorant of the part played in that work by the Saviour's death: by dying, the latter has conquered death; [10] and the result of this victory has been for us incorruptibility (*ἀφθαρσία*).[11]

The Church is, precisely, the assembly of those who strive to become worthy, by their efforts, of this everlasting life and who live in justice. She is the κλῆσις τῶν ἁγίων.[1] To belong to the Church, one must not only have faith, but also observe God's precepts.[2]

---

[1] *Contra Noet.*, 8, 14.

[2] *Contra Noet.*, 8, 12.

[3] *Contra Noet.*, 17, 18.

[4] *Contra Noet.*, 17.

[5] *De Christo et Antichristo*, 4, 26; *Contra Noet.*, 6, 13, 14, 17, 18.

[6] *Contra Noet.*, 15: Οὔθ' ἡ σάρξ καθ' ἑαυτὴν δίχα τοῦ λόγου ὑποστᾶναι ἠδύνατο, διὰ τὸ ἐν λόγῳ τὴν σύστασιν ἔχειν.

[7] *De Christo et Antichristo*, 3, 4; *Contra Noet.*, 17.

[8] *Contra Noet.*, 17.

[9] *De Christo et Antichristo*, 26; cf. 44; *In Danielem*, IV, 11, 5.

[10] *De Christo et Antichristo*, 26.

[11] *Contra Noet.*, 17, 18.

St. Hippolytus mentions quite frequently Baptism, and the remission of sins which results from it;[3] likewise he mentions Confirmation,[4] and apparently sees in the Eucharist the body and blood of Jesus Christ.[5] At any rate, he speaks of the sacrifice offered in every place and among all nations.

Side by side with the Trinitarian doctrine, St. Hippolytus also treats of eschatology at length. His teaching, however, sometimes lacks clearness and consistency. He seems to admit a judgment for every man immediately after death,[6] and regards the Prophets, Martyrs and Apostles as already reigning with Christ.[7] The wicked, he says elsewhere, shall undergo the punishment of fire, and this punishment shall be everlasting.[8] When it is to begin, is not clearly stated. Anyhow, the end of the world shall soon come: the author does not place it later than two or three hundred years, for — according to a calculation already ancient — the world is to last 6000 years (6 days of 1000 years each), and Jesus Christ was born in the year 5,500. Then the seventh day shall follow, that is, the Sabbath during which the Saints will reign with Jesus Christ.[9] Will this 7th day last only 1000 years, like the others? St. Hippolytus does not give here an explicit affirmative answer;[10]

---

[1] *In Daniel.*, I, 17, 5–7; I, 14, 5.

[2] *In Daniel.*, I, 17, 14; cf. IV, 38, 2.

[3] *In Daniel.*, I, 16, 2, 3; IV, 36, 4; *De Christo et Antichr.*, 59.

[4] *In Daniel.*, I, 16, 3; *De Christo et Antichr.*, 59.

[5] *In Genesim*, XLIX, 20, and XXXVIII, 19, edit. H. Achelis, pp. 66, 96. St. Jerome tells us (*Epist.* LXXI, 6) that St. Hippolytus had written "De Eucharistia an accipienda quotidie."

[6] *In Daniel.*, IV, 18, 7.

[7] *De Christo et Antichr.*, 30, 31, 59.

[8] *In Proverb.*, XI, 30; *De Christo et Antichr.*, 5; *In Daniel.*, IV, 10, 3; IV, 12, 1, etc.

[9] *In Daniel.*, IV, chapt. 23 and 24.

[10] *In Daniel.*, IV, 23, 5.

nay, he seems to deny it emphatically in the *Capita adversus Caium*. Hence it cannot be affirmed unhesitatingly that he is a Millenarian.—As to the lengthy researches he made about the circumstances of the last days, circumstances which he describes in his *De Christo et Antichristo*, they present but little originality. He follows step by step the Biblical texts that may enlighten him and endeavors to hold, in their interpretation, the golden mean between a narrow literalism and an arbitrary allegorism.

With St. Hippolytus we may join, if not identify, the author of the *Philosophoumena*,[1] his contemporary and his ally in the struggle against Patripassianism. The Trinitarian system, set forth in the work before us (X, 32, 33) reproduces substantially that of the holy Doctor. At first, God is alone; nothing is coeternal with Him, but He begets by thought His Word (*λόγον πρῶτον ἐννοηθεὶς ἀπογεννᾷ*). The world is *ἐξ οὐδενός*, and therefore is not God: while the Word is from God, and is the only one that is from God, and therefore He is God, God's essence (*τούτου ὁ λόγος μόνος ἐξ αὐτοῦ [θεοῦ]· διὸ καὶ θεὸς οὐσία ὑπάρχων θεοῦ*). True, the author advances the strange idea that, had God wished to make man God (*θεόν σε ποιῆσαι*), He might have done so; and he adds: "This is proved to you by the example of the Word." Nevertheless, he manifestly establishes a difference between the Word and the other beings. The former is begotten (*ἐγέννα, γεγεννηκότος*); the latter are created.

It is precisely for this creation that the Word is produced. This is why He bears in Himself the ideas and will of the Father, and, at His command, brings the world into reality in keeping with these ideas and in harmony with that will. The Father commands and the Logos obeys.

---

[1] Although this identity is granted by most scholars, yet it may be better to treat apart the doctrine of the *Philosophoumena*. The edition quoted is that of P. Cruice, *Philosophoumena, sive haeresium omnium confutatio*, Paris, 1860. — Works: The same as for St. Hippolytus.

The rest of the doctrine offers nothing original, except the thought at the end. The Word took our nature from a virgin ([ἐκ] τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς φυράματος), that He might rightly require our submission and stand before us as a model. He subjected Himself to our needs and weaknesses (X, 33), and brought to us regeneration together with the remission of sins (X, 34, p. 524).—As regards man, created free, he is the author of evil (X, 33, pp. 518, 519, 521); and will be punished for it. Hell everlasting, with its darkness, fire and never-dying worm, will chastise the wicked (X, 9, 34, pp. 522, 523). On the contrary, the just that shall do good will be rewarded by the close friendship of God, the immortality of the body and of the soul (*ἀθανασία, ἀφθαρσία*): nay, they will become like to God, since He has created us for this very purpose: *οὐ γὰρ πτωχεύει θεὸς* [*ὁ*] *καὶ σε θεὸν ποιήσας εἰς δόξαν αὐτοῦ* (X, 34).

§ 2.—Tertullian.[1]

To Tertullian the title of founder of Theology in the West, which we have inscribed at the beginning of this chapter, belongs preëminently. Until the end of the second century, that Theology had used Greek and was not distinct, in its conception and exposition of Christianity, from Greek Theology, the only Theology, in fact, existing in the Church since the Apologists. But, at this time, a separation took place: the two Theologies, Greek and Latin, break off, like two distinct boughs, from the parent-trunk, in which they had remained so far as one. Henceforth, both will use their own respective tongue and betray, in some of their fundamental theories, not indeed doctrinal divergences, but dissimilar preoccupations, characteristics of presentation and intellectual tendencies. The great author who was the first thus to impart to Latin Theology its distinctive aspect and stamp is Tertullian.

---

[1] The edition quoted is that of FR. ŒHLER, *Q. S. F. Tertulliani quae supersunt omnia*, Leipsic, 1853–1854.—Works: E. NOELDECHEN, *Tertullian*, Gotha, 1890. P. MONCEAUX, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, I, Paris, 1904. A. D'ALÈS, *La Théologie de Tertullien*, Paris, 1905. G. CAUCANAS, *Tertullien et le Montanisme*, Geneva, 1876. P. A. KLAP, *Tertullianus en het montanisme*, *Theolog. Studien*, 1897. G. ESSER, *Die Seelenlehre Tertullians*, Paderborn, 1893. G. SCHELOWSKY, *Der Apologet Tertullianus in seinem Verhältnis zu der griechisch-römischen Philosophie*, Leipsic, 1901. E. F. SCHULZE, *Elemente einer Theodicee bei Tertullian*, in the *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theologie*, XLIII, 1900. M. WINKLER, *Der Traditionsbegriff des Urchristentums bis Tertullian*, München, 1897. J. STIER, *Die Gottes und Logos Lehre Tertullians*, Göttingen, 1899. J. KOLBERG, *Verfassung, Kultus und Disziplin der christlichen Kirche nach der Schriften Tertullians*, Braunsberg, 1886. FR. S. RENZ, *Die Geschichte des Messopfer-Begriffs*, I, Freising, 1901. FR. NIELSEN, *Tertullians Ethik. Afhandling*, Schonberg, 1879. K. H. WIRTH, *Der "Verdienst" Begriff in der christlichen Kirche*, I, Leipsic, 1892. CH. GUIGNEBERT, *Tertullien, étude sur ses sentiments à l'égard de l'empire et de la société civile*, Paris, 1901. P. BATIFFOL, *L'Eglise Naiss. et le Catholicisme*, 1909, pp. 317–353. H. LECLERCQ, *L'Afrique Chrétienne*, I, Paris, 1904.

All know the nature of his mind: rugged, vigorous, remarkably supple and powerful, but lacking that measure which maintains a man in sound views and marks out practicable courses. A philosopher he was not: he had no bent towards speculation and he viewed Christian revelation neither as a light which comes to expand our intellectual horizon nor as a sum of truths that call for our investigation. But he was preeminently endowed with the juridical sense. He was a lawyer who saw in Christianity first of all a fact and a law. The fact had to be proven and understood; the law, to be interpreted and above all, to be kept. God is for us a master and a creditor: we are His subjects and His debtors. Hence, to determine our dealings with Him, — viz., our religious attitude and relations in His regard, — it is but just that we should apply the principles of human legislation and carry into this application the strictness which prevails when debts and civil rights have to be stated with precision: a mere question of liabilities and capital, which can be treated with the exactness of commercial transactions.

This conception manifestly leaves no room, in religious faith, for mystic intuition, for direct and intimate experience, for the effusion of the heart and the abandon of the soul to God; and therefore it would have completely dried up — so to speak — Latin Theology, had not other influences — for instance, that of St. Augustine — set right, in the fourth and in the fifth century, what was excessive. On the other hand, it was remarkably fitted to impart firmness and precision to theological language, and great indeed is the service Tertullian rendered to that Theology by supplying it from the very start with an almost determined terminology, and a certain number of definitive formulas. He truly created Latin theological language. The first to appear, and himself a master in the art of writing, he knew how to bend a synthetic and rebellious idiom to new ideas, some of them quite abstract indeed. If he was careless of its rules and constantly offended against its purity, at least he enriched its vocabulary and enlarged its compass. He made it convey sentiments unknown to it until that time, and thus rendered it capable of becoming in the West and for many years the means ordinarily used and everywhere received, of expressing Christian faith.

So, Latin Theology depends on Tertullian to a great extent, that is, as to forms of thought and of expression. Moreover, nothing shows more conclusively how perfectly this conception and this language agreed with the needs and tendencies of the Western mind, than their preservation through the course of ages and the facility with which they are understood by us in this very day. It has been rightly remarked that, though he is the most ancient of Latin Fathers, and though several parts of his teaching betoken the early stage of Christian doctrine, still, when we read Tertullian, we find that we are dealing almost with one of our contemporaries. His theological cast of mind is ours; his reasonings on dogmatic, moral and disciplinary topics are those we ourselves would make; we enter into his views and share his preoccupations; we peruse his writings without the least difficulty.

Such as he is, Tertullian, then, is an author who must be studied most closely by any one who is anxious to lay hold, at their birth, of certain theories and formulas peculiar to the Latin Church.

He had not always been a Christian, but, after his conversion, he openly claimed the right to remain such and boldly defended the Church against the persecutions of Paganism. His *Apologeticum* has been already studied. The treatises he wrote for the same purpose — the two books *Ad Nationes* and the letter *Ad Scapulam* — are respectively of the years 197 and 212.[1] Passing from the defence to the attack, Tertullian did not fail to jeer unmercifully at the criminal and obscene deeds of Polytheism.[2] Nevertheless, he pretended to remain faithful to the State and to the Emperor: of his loyalty, at least in intention, there is no doubt.[3]

His attitude towards Philosophy varied according as he saw in it the help or the adversary of faith. Now and then, he realizes and writes down that Philosophy agrees with Christianity as to the fundamental truths of revealed Dogma and Moral; that some of its representatives have guessed and known beforehand, at least vaguely, the Logos, the Angels and the Demons, and a few others of our beliefs:[4] "Seneca saepe noster!"[5] that the human soul is in some way naturally prepared to welcome the divine word;[6] and in these cases, Tertullian considers Philosophy an ally and a beneficent power. But when he notices that heresies have precisely come from the very attempts made by their authors to combine the data of their philosophy with those of their faith, and from their endeavors to bend the latter to human systems, then he gets indignant and impatient: "Adeo quid simile philosophus et christianus? Graeciae discipulus et coeli? famae negotiator et vitae? . . . Amicus et inimicus erroris? veritatis interpolator et integrator et expressor, et furator eius et custos?"[1] Heresies are the fruit of Philosophy;[2] philosophers are the "patriarchs of heretics."[3]

---

[1] Scholars disagree sometimes as to the dates of Tertullian's writings: I have adopted here and all through this work those suggested by P. MONCEAUX, *Op. cit.*, pp. 208, 209.

[2] For instance, *Apologetic.*, 9, foll.

[3] *Ad Scapulam*, 2; *Apologetic.*, 30, 33, 39.

[4] *Apologetic.*, 21, 22, 48.

[5] *De anima*, 20.

[6] *Apologetic.*, 17, 21; 46–48; *De spectaculis*, 2; *De anima*, 2; *De testimonio animae*, the whole work.

Besides, it is not from reason or Philosophy that Tertullian asks what he ought to believe. He asks it from the Apostolic Churches, the mothers of all other Churches. The Son alone knows the Father; He has imparted to the Apostles alone the knowledge He has of the Father; to them alone He has left His doctrine and teachings. In their turn, the Apostles have communicated these to the Churches they founded. These Churches, then, are the depositaries of religious truth; and they are in the possession of truth who share their faith, while those who do not accept their testimony are in the path of error.[4] Now, for the Africans and the faithful who dwell near Italy, the Apostolic Mother-Church is that of Rome; so that, in order to know with precision what has to be believed, it suffices to examine what she herself believes and what she has taught Africa: "Si autem Italiae adiaces, habes Romam unde nobis quoque auctoritas praesto est . . . videamus quid didicerit, quid docuerit, cum Africanis quoque ecclesiis contesserarit."[1] By this appeal to the Church and to Antiquity, Tertullian puts the heretics to silence and even forbids them to allege Holy Writ in behalf of their doctrine. The Scriptures belong to the Church; they are her property, not that of heretics; these are not legally allowed to bring them forward as a proof. This is the *praescriptio*: "Si haec ita se habent . . . constat ratio propositi nostri definientis non esse admittendos haereticos ad ineundam de scripturis provocationem, quos sine scripturis probamus ad scripturas non pertinere . . . Mea est possessio, olim possideo, prior possideo, habeo origines firmas ab ipsis auctoribus quorum fuit res. Ego sum haeres apostolorum."[2]

---

[1] *Apologet.*, 46.

[2] *De praescript.*, 7, and cf. *De anima*, 23.

[3] *De anima*, 3.

[4] Si haec ita sunt constat perinde omnem doctrinam quae cum illis ecclesiis apostolicis matricibus et originalibus fidei conspiret veritati deputandam, id sine dubio tenentem quod ecclesiae ab apostolis, apostoli a Christo, Christus a deo accepit; omnem vero doctrinam de mendacio praejudicandam quae sapiat contra veritatem ecclesiarum et apostolorum, Christi et dei. (*De praescript.*, 21, 32, 36).

This teaching of the Mother-Churches, Tertullian finds summed up in the Symbol — the "regula fidei," the "lex fidei," as he says, speaking as a lawyer,[3] — of which he reproduces the substance, nay the wording itself.[4] This Symbol cannot be discussed; unlike the discipline and customs that can be modified[5] it cannot be touched nor improved.[6] Even the new effusion of the Paraclete, which began with Montanus, treated the Symbol with due regard, although it did away with some indulgences as to morality allowed by Jesus Christ.[7] But outside the domain of the Symbol, for the points in which there is obscurity or uncertainty, our author admits researches and conjectures.[8]

The fundamental object of our faith is God. Many — particularly St. Augustine[9] — have pointed out in Tertullian's teaching on the nature of God this peculiarity, that he seems to make Him a corporeal being: "Quis enim negabit deum corpus esse, etsi deus spiritus est? Spiritus enim corpus sui generis in sua effigie." [1] However, in many places, and in this very place, our author states that God is spiritual.[2] Hence the question arises: does he not admit, like the Stoics, between the body and the spirit a mere difference of degree as regards the subtility of the matter of which they are made up? Strictly speaking, he may have done so; but more probably the writer used here the word *corpus* as synonymous of *substantia:* the substance, as he himself explains elsewhere, being the body and, as it were, the solid element of the being of which it is the basis.[3]

---

[1] *De praescript.*, 36.
[2] *De praescript.*, 37.
[3] *De praescript.*, 13, 14; *De virginibus velandis*, 1.
[4] *De praescript.*, 13; *De virginib. velandis*, 1.
[5] *De virginib. veland.*, 1.
[6] *De virginib. veland.*, 1.
[7] *De virginib. veland.*, 1; *De monogamia*, 14.
[8] *De praescript.*, 14.
[9] *Epist.* 190, IV, 14.

In his Trinitarian doctrine, Tertullian offers the most complete expression of the teaching set up by his school against Patripassianism at the beginning of the third century. He had already sketched it in the year 197 in his *Apologeticum* (21); but he worked it up again and revised it carefully in his *Adversus Praxean* written between the years 213–225 (?): in the following exposition of his teaching, we shall consult chiefly this last work.[4]

Like the Apologists, Tertullian starts that exposition with the Father's person. In the beginning, he tells us, God is alone; but this God has in Himself His reason, and in His reason, the interior word which always accompanies its exercise: a word of which God, by his intimate conversation, makes thus a second term: "habentem in semetipso proinde rationem, et in ratione sermonem, quem secundum a se faceret agitando intra se" (5).

---

[1] *Adv. Praxean*, 7; cf. *De carne Christi*, 11.

[2] For instance, *Apologet.*, 21.

[3] *Adv. Hermogenem*, 35.

[4] Unless otherwise stated, the following numbers of chapters placed between parentheses refer to the *Adversus Praxean.*

When the moment has come to create, God utters that interior word which contains His reason and ideas; and the whole world is thereby created (6). This utterance or prolation constitutes the Word's perfect birth: "haec est nativitas perfecta sermonis" (7); for though before that, He was conceived, carried in the Father's bosom (" vulva cordis ") (7), strictly speaking, He was not begotten, born. At this precise moment, God becomes Father: which He was not until then: "Quia et pater Deus est, et iudex Deus est, non ideo tamen pater et iudex semper quia Deus semper. Nam nec pater potuit esse ante filium, nec iudex ante delictum. Fuit autem tempus cum et delictum et filius non fuit, quod iudicem et qui patrem dominum faceret." [1]

As to the Holy Ghost, Tertullian says little about His procession. He makes Him originate *a Patre per filium* (4): "a deo et filio sicut tertius a radice fructus a frutice, et tertius a fonte rivus a flumine, et tertius a sole apex ex radio" (8).

There are then three terms in God: the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. What are they in themselves and in what mutual relation do they stand?

First of all, our author observes, we must affirm God's unity (2): yet, this unity does not exclude a certain *economy*. Of the word *οἰκονωμία* Tertullian is rather fond (3); according to him, it signifies that there is in God a dispensation, a communication of the unity; and thus the trinity flows from the unity: "unitatem in trinitatem disponit" (2). This dispensation does not divide, but merely distributes the unity: it does not destroy, but organizes, the monarchy. As to the new terms thus obtained, they are spiritual substances (*substantivae res*, 26, cf. 7), portions, as it were, of the whole divine substance (*ex ipsius dei substantia — ut portio aliqua totius*, 26, cf. 9); they are *persons* (*illam dico personam*, 7, cf. too 11,

---

[1] *Adv. Hermogen.*, 3.

12, 13, 15, 18, 21, 23, 24, 27, 31). Tertullian uses also the words *species*, *forma*, *gradus* (2, 8), as equivalent to *persona*.

These three persons are numerically distinct among themselves. The great African Doctor has made good this truth against the Sabellians with an abundance of texts and arguments that leave no room for reply: "Duos quidem definimus patrem et filium, et iam tres cum spiritu sancto secundum rationem oeconomiae quae facit numerum" (13, 2, 8, 12, 22, 25). On the other hand, these three persons are God: they have the same nature, substance, state, power and virtue: "Et pater deus, et filius deus, et spiritus sanctus deus, et deus unusquisque" (13). "Tres autem non statu, sed gradu, nec substantia, sed forma, nec potestate, sed specie, unius autem substantiae et unius status et unius potestatis" (2, cf. 22). They are not *unus;* "unus enim singularis numeri significatio videtur" (22); but they are *unum*, because among them there is unity of substance: "Ego et Pater unum sumus, ad substantiae unitatem, non ad numeri singularitatem" (25). Again Tertullian regards this unity of substance, not as simply specific or generic, but as numerical and absolute. This may be inferred, on the one hand, from the insistence with which he affirms that, between the Father and the Son, there is distinction and distribution of the unity, not separation and division (2, 3, 8, 9); on the other hand, from the way in which he constantly contrasts the numerical trinity of the Persons with the unity of the substance, the unity of God (2); for, he says, though the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are God, there is but one only God (2, 13): they are "a trinity of one divinity,"[1] and the Son is God only from the unity of the Father ("deus ex unitate patris").[2]

So Tertullian reached the consubstantial strictly so called and found its definitive formula: "*tres personae, una sub-*

---

[1] *De pudicitia*, 21.

[2] *Adv. Prax.*, 19, cf. 12, 18

stantia,"[1] which will remain the formula of the Latin Church. He *reached* the consubstantial, although, so to speak, he did not get hold of it, nor realize all its bearing. This we have already seen from his doctrine of the temporal generation of the Word: the same inconsistency shows itself in his subordinationism. The Son, he observes, possesses the divine substance, yet less fully than the Father: the latter is the whole of which the Son is but a part: "Pater enim tota substantia est, filius vero derivatio totius et portio" (9). "Substantiva res est (filius), et ut portio aliqua totius" (26, cf. 14).[2] The Father is greater than the Son (9); He cannot be seen "pro plenitudine maiestatis," while the Son can be seen "pro modulo derivationis" "pro temperatura portionis" (14). The Son alone can come in contact with the finite.[3] His authority, like that of a minister, is imparted to Him by the Father to whom one day He is to give it back (3, 4). We recognize here St. Justin's ideas.

On the other hand, Tertullian's teaching on the Holy Ghost is remarkable in every way. The first, and the only one of the Fathers until St. Athanasius, he affirmed His divinity in an express, clear and precise manner. A Montanist when he wrote the *Adversus Praxean*, and a firm believer in the new revelations, he emphatically proclaimed the greatness of the Paraclete. The Holy Spirit is God (13, 20), of the Father's substance (3, 4), one same God with the Father and the Son (2), proceeding by and through the Son (4, 8), vicar (*vicaria vis*) of the Son,[4] teacher of all truth (2).

---

[1] Harnack (*Lehrb. der D G.*, II, pp. 285, ff., note; *History of Dogma*, vol. IV, pp. 121, ff., note) has maintained that Tertullian had used these words only in a juridical sense, viz., as designating a moral person and riches or goods possessed. But this view cannot be upheld (cf. SEEBERG, *Lehrb. der D G.*, p. 87, note 1).

[2] *Adv. Marcion.*, III, 6.

[3] *Adv. Marcion.*, II, 27.

[4] *De praescript.*, 13.

Such as it is and in spite of the shortcomings we may notice in it, the Trinitarian teaching of Tertullian marked a wonderful progress on what had been previously held. A hundred years, before Nicæa, the faith of the Church was stamped therein, with its correct and definitive expression. Even the theory of the generation in time was partly amended by the distinction between the conception of the Word *ad intra* and His generation *ad extra:* subordinationism was made less offensive by the close relation established between the Son's inferiority and His origin, a relation which tended to ascribe that inferiority to His personality rather than to His nature. One step more in this direction, and the last traces of the confusions of old will have disappeared.

While, as we have already seen, it would be probably unfair to charge Tertullian with having taught God's corporeity, there is no doubt that he admitted the corporeity of the human soul.[1] This doctrine he borrowed from those Stoics, to whom he appeals,[2] and from the physician Soranos of Ephesus whose authority he highly extols.[3] Moreover, he rests it on a peculiar vision of a woman, a Montanist, to whom a soul had appeared "tenera et lucida et aerii coloris, et forma per omnia humana." [4] In spite of that, he affirms that the soul is simple and indivisible,[5] immortal in as much as it emanates from the breath of God.[6] Tertullian is dichotomist; [7] he rejects the preëxistence of souls as well as metempsychosis; [8] but he admits a gross traducianism: the soul is sown like the body, and like it, receives a sex;[1] and thus all souls were contained in Adam from whom they come.[2]

---

[1] For instance, *De anima,* 9.

[2] *De anima,* 5.

[3] *De anima,* 6, 8, 14, 15, 25.

[4] *De anima,* 9.

[5] *De anima,* 10, 14, 22.

[6] *De anima,* 6, 9, 14, 22, 53; *Apologet.,* 48; *De resurrectione carnis,* 3.

[7] *De anima,* 18.

[8] *De anima,* 4, 24, 28–30; 31–33.

Our author affirmed human freedom most emphatically and saw in the exercise of that liberty the explanation of moral evil and of sin.[3] He saw it too in man's degradation since our first parents' disobedience. That fault brought on for all mankind not only death, but also other faults and their punishment: "Homo damnatur in mortem ob unius arbusculae delibationem, et exinde proficiunt delicta cum poenis, et pereunt iam omnes qui paradisi nullam cespitem norunt."[4] "Portavimus enim imaginem choici per collegium transgressionis, per consortium mortis, per exilium paradisi."[5] It introduced into the soul, into all souls, a stain, an original blemish, a bent to sin. Here we find in Tertullian's thought some lack of precision, which makes it impossible for us to tell with certainty whether he sees in that stain a sin strictly so called or only the concupiscence that leads to it. However the former hypothesis seems to agree with his sentiment: "Ita omnis anima eo usque in Adam censetur donec in Christo recenseatur, tamdiu immunda quamdiu recenseatur."[6] Anyhow, he does not hesitate to say that it is because of our birth and descent from Adam that we have a share in its evil character and well deserved chastisements: "Per quem (Satanam) homo a primordiis circumventus . . . exinde totum genus de suo semine infectum, suae etiam damnationis traducem fecit."[7] There is, in this series of affirmations, at least a sketch of the theory of original sin which Theology was later on to develop and complete.

Fallen man needs a redeemer. This redeemer is Jesus Christ. As for the Trinity, so also when speaking of the Saviour's person, Tertullian knows how to strike the exact word and the definitive formula. His Christology has all the merits of his Trinitarian doctrine, and none of its defects.

---

[1] *De anima*, 36.
[2] *De anima*, 40.
[3] *Adv. Marcion.*, II, 5, 6, 7.
[4] *Adv. Marcion.*, I, 22.
[5] *De resurrectione carnis*, 49.
[6] *De anima*, 40; cf. 16, 41.
[7] *De testimonio animae*, 3.

Manifold indeed were the errors he had to oppose on this subject: first of all, Docetism under its various shapes: some, like Marcion, denying the reality even of the body of Jesus; others, like Apelles, looking upon it as an astral and heavenly, or even, like Valentinus, as a psychical and spiritual body: all agreeing in denying the true birth of the Redeemer *ex Maria;* then Gnostic dualism, the forerunner of Nestorianism, admitting a factitious and often transitory union between the two elements, divine and human. Moreover Tertullian seems to have met men who saw in the incarnation a transformation of the Word into the flesh, or a fusing of the two united natures into one. To all these errors he opposed precise arguments.

The body of Jesus Christ, he affirms, is real, conceived and brought forth like ours, made up, like ours, of flesh and bones.[1] Those who deny that reality do away at the same time with the Saviour's sufferings and death, and transform into a mere illusion all the economy of Redemption: a consequence which draws from the great polemical writer a sublime exclamation: "Parce unicae spei totius orbis!"[2] — Moreover the body of Christ is not heavenly: it was really born.[3] The Angels that appeared could frame for themselves sidereal bodies, for they did not come down to die, but Christ, who came down to die, must have been really born.[4] So, He was born, and born from the very substance of the Virgin, *ex ea.*

---

[1] *De carne Christi*, 1, 5, 9.

[2] *De carne Christi*, 5; *Adv. Marcion.*, III, 8.

[3] *De carne Christi*, 2.

[4] "Non venerant mori; ideo nec nasci. At vero Christus mori missus nasci quoque necessario habuit ut mori posset" (*De carne Christi*, 6; cf. 3; *Adv. Marcion.*, III, 9).

The author insists on this point,[1] and, to convince us of it, does not hesitate to accumulate grossly realistic details. Nay, through fear that the birth of Jesus *ex Maria* might be open to suspicion, if he should teach that the Virgin remained virgin even as regards the childbirth (*uterus clausus*), he rejects this view unhesitatingly: "virgo quantum a viro: non virgo quantum a partu . . . Itaque magis (vulva) patefacta est quia magis erat clausa. Utique magis non virgo dicenda est quam virgo." [2] — Thus Jesus is of our kin: and as He took our body, because He was to save it,[3] so also He took our soul, a soul spiritual and intelligent.[4] He is then a perfect man, sharing our passions, our weaknesses, our infirmities, barring sin: [5] He is the new man, the new Adam.[6]

Yet, as Tertullian declares,[7] He is also God; and hence the question arises as to the way in which we should conceive and express the union in Him between the divine and the human. At first Tertullian looks upon that union as a kind of mixture so intimate that God may truly be said to have become little, to have been born and crucified: "Miscente in semetipso hominem et Deum . . . Deus pusillus inventus est ut homo maximus fieret. Qui talem Deum dedignaris nescio an ex fide credas Deum crucifixum." [8] "Nasci se Deus in utero patitur matris." [9] Soon, however, his pen writes down the definitive formula: "Si et apostolus (*Rom.*, 1^3) de utraque eius (Christi) substantia docet: qui factus est, inquit, ex semine David, hic erit homo et filius hominis qui definitus est filius Dei secundum spiritum. Hic erit Deus et sermo Dei filius. Videmus duplicem statum non confusum, sed coniunctum in una persona, Deum et hominem Iesum." [1]

---

[1] *De carne Christi*, 19–21.
[2] *De carne Christi*, 23.
[3] *De carne Christi*, 16, 14; cf. 7.
[4] *De carne Christi*, 10, 14; *De resurrect. carnis*, 53.
[5] *De carne Christi*, 5–9.
[6] *De resurrect. carnis*, 53.
[7] *De praescript.*, 10, 33; *De carne Christi*, 14, 18, etc.
[8] *Adv. Marcion.*, II, 27; cf. *Apologetic.*, 21.
[9] *De patientia*, 3.

There is then in Jesus Christ only one person, but two substances, *una persona, duae substantiae*.[2] Hence we cannot speak of a transformation of the divinity into the humanity,[3] no more than of a fusion, a combination that would have made only one substance out of two.[4] Each one remains what it is; nay, each one keeps its own distinct operations. So, the teaching of the Council of Chalcedon and of St. Leo is formulated beforehand: "Sed quia substantiae ambae in statu suo quæque distincte agebant, ideo illis et operae et exitus sui occurrerunt." [5] "Quae proprietas conditionum divinae et humanae aequa utique naturae utriusque veritate dispuncta est, eadem fide et spiritus et carnis. Virtutes spiritum Dei, passiones carnem hominis probaverunt." [6]

Though Tertullian developed in none of his works his soteriological teaching, but only sketched it, yet it is manifest that he looked upon the Incarnation as the consequence of a substitution of Jesus Christ the innocent in the place of sinners, and of an expiation supplied by the same Jesus Christ dying for us. For our death could not be repaired but by the Lord's death.[7] On the other hand, Jesus Christ is the new Adam in whom all souls were contained;[1] and His Father had sent Him, who was sinless and holy, precisely that He might die for sinners. This the Saviour did, and thus He freed us from our faults and from the death we deserved for them.[2]

---

[1] *Adv. Praxean*, 27. As to the meaning of the word *status*, cf. *Adv. Prax.*, 2.

[2] We may observe that Tertullian always uses the word *substantia* to designate the nature. In the Trinity, *una substantia, tres personae*. The word *natura* has for him another meaning: it designates the properties that may be common to several diverse substances (*De anima*, 32). However, cf. below. Anyhow, the use of *natura* to designate the natures in Jesus Christ was uncommon till the fifth century.

[3] "Transfiguratus in carne an indutus carnem? Imo indutus" (*Adv. Prax.*, 27; *De carne Christi*, 3, 18).

[4] *Adv. Praxean*, 27.

[5] *Adv. Praxean*, 27.

[6] *De carne Christi*, 5.

[7] *De baptismo*, 11; cf. *De pudicitia*, 22.

However, salvation is a personal work, and the merits and satisfactions of Jesus Christ do not exempt us from meriting by ourselves our happiness and atoning for our sins. This theory of merit and satisfaction is perhaps the one which, in his whole work, betrays most his legal spirit. He framed for that theory a terminology which still survives and remains a characteristic of Latin theology.[3] Not that our author ignores the share of Jesus in the fulfilment of good works;[4] but, outside this consideration, the relations between God and man are, for him, nothing, strictly speaking, but the relations between lord and servant and involve their consequences. If we act well, we gain *merit* with God, nay we merit God: "Omnes salutis in promerendo Deo petitores."[5] "Quomodo multae mansiones apud patrem, si non pro varietate meritorum?"[6] God becomes our *debtor:* "Bonum factum deum habet debitorem, sicuti et malum, quia iudex omnis remunerator est causae."[7] The reward is a price: "eadem pretia quae et merces."[8] On the contrary, through sin, we *offend* God and become His debtors; but we can and we must give Him *satisfaction:* "Offendisti, sed reconciliari adhuc potes, habes cui satisfacias et quidem volentem."[9] We satisfy through penance,[1] which is a *compensation* we offer to God: "Quam porro ineptum quam paenitentiam non implere, ei veniam delictorum sustinere? Hoc est pretium non exhibere, ad mercem manum emittere. Hoc enim pretio dominus veniam addicere instituit; hac paenitentiae compensatione redimendam proponit impunitatem." [2] I need not insist on the peculiar character of this phraseology: we have found nothing like it in Origen.

---

[1] *De resurrectione carnis*, 53; *De anima*, 40.

[2] *De pudicitia*, 22; *De patientia*, 3.

[3] Harnack, *Lehrb. der D G.*, III, pp. 16 and ff., note 1; *History of Dogma*, vol. V, pp. 16, ff.; p. 18, note.

[4] *Ad uxorem*, I, 8; *De anima*, 21.

[5] *De paenitentia*, 6.

[6] *Scorpiace*, 6; *De oratione*, 3, 4.

[7] *De paenitentia*, 2; *De exhort. castit.*, 2.

[8] *Scorpiace*, 6.

[9] *De paenitentia*, 7; cf. 10, 11.

Although Tertullian has a correct idea of the whole Church, comparing it, as St. Paul does, to the body of Jesus,[3] he turns his attention in the Church chiefly to the particular churches and communities of which it is made up, viewing them independently of each other. These churches were founded by the Apostles or by their successors, and their faith is one; [4] but those set up by the Apostles themselves enjoy, as we have seen, a special consideration: their belief is the standard of truth.[5] The praise which, on this occasion, the author bestows on the Church of Rome [6] does not necessarily imply that he ascribed to her a primacy, strictly so called, of jurisdiction. Likewise, nothing can be drawn in this regard from the titles of *pontifex maximus* and *episcopus episcoporum* which he applies in contempt probably to Callistus,[7] and the bearing of which it is difficult to state with anything like precision.— Besides our author acknowledges the legitimacy of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, which he declares is made up of the bishop — the *summus sacerdos* — priests and deacons.[8] However, in his *De exhortatione castitatis*, written between the years 208–

---

[1] *De paenitentia*, 5; cf. *De ieiunio*, 3; *De pudicitia*, 9, 13; *De patientia*, 13.

[2] *De paenitentia*, 6; *De patientia*, 16; cf. *Scorpiace*, 6.

[3] *Adv. Marcion.*, V, 18.

[4] *De praescript.*, 32, 36; *De virgin. vel.*, 2.

[5] *De praescript.*, 32, 36.

[6] *De praescript.*, 36.

[7] *De pudicitia*, 1.

[8] *De baptismo*, 17; cf. *De monogamia*, 11.

211, he states that the distinction between the clergy and the laity has been established by the Church, and that, for want of the former, any ordinary Christian may fulfil the priestly functions: "Nonne et laici sacerdotes sumus? . . . Adeo ubi ecclesiastici ordinis non est consessus, et offers, et tinguis, et sacerdos es tibi solus. Sed ubi tres, ecclesia est, licet laici . . . Igitur si habes ius sacerdotis in temetipso, ubi necesse est, etc;" and he quotes *Apocalypse*, 1^6.[1] He even goes farther in his *De pudicitia* (217–222), whose tendencies are altogether montanistic, and seems to grant to the *Spirituals* alone the power of remitting certain sins: a power he denies to bishops.[2]

For Tertullian, the necessity of Sacraments is justified and their efficacy accounted for, by the union between body and soul. The sensible sign, acting on the body, is the instrument of the interior working, the vehicle of grace which reaches the soul: "Supervenit enim statim spiritus de caelis, et aquis superest, sanctificans eas de semetipso, et ita sanctificatae vim sanctificandi combibunt." [3] There are too these classical words in which the three Sacraments of Christian initiation are successively mentioned: "Caro salutis est cardo. De qua cum anima deo allegitur, ipsa est quae efficit ut anima allegi possit. Scilicet caro abluitur ut anima emaculetur; caro ungitur, ut anima consecretur; caro signatur, ut et anima muniatur; caro manus impositione adumbratur, ut et anima spiritu illuminetur; caro corpore et sanguine Christi vescitur, ut et anima de deo saginetur." [4]

Our author devoted a special treatise to Baptism. This Baptism, he says, is administered in the name of the three divine Persons,[5] and the Christian, as the divine ἰχθὺς, is born in water.[6] In the actual economy, Baptism is required for salvation, though it can be replaced by martyrdom.[7] Its effect is to remit sins;[1] it is imparted only once.[2] Tertullian considers as void the baptism administered by heretics.[3] As Irenæus and Origen, he witnesses to the custom of baptizing children, which, however, he does not favor; for he thinks it would be better if the candidate to Baptism were taught beforehand Christian doctrine and gave solid hope that he would persevere.[4] It belongs first to the bishop and then, after him and with his consent, to priests and deacons, to give Baptism: simple laymen too can do it, but not women.[5] It is solemnly conferred chiefly at Easter and Pentecost; though, as to its efficacy, all days are good: "Si de solemnitate interest, de gratia nihil refert."[6]

---

[1] *De exhortatione castitatis*, 17.

[2] *De pudicitia*, 21.

[3] *De baptismo*, 4.

[4] *De resurrectione carnis*, 8.

[5] *De baptismo*, 13; *Adv. Prax.*, 26.

[6] *De bapt.*, 1.

[7] *De bapt.*, 12, 13, 16.

It has been already noticed that Tertullian mentions Confirmation and assigns as its twofold rite the *consignatio* and the laying on of hands.[7] His Eucharistic doctrine has given rise to some difficulties: however, on the whole, it is manifestly orthodox. The Eucharist is for him the body and blood of the Lord, on which the flesh is fed, that the soul may fatten on God;[8] which the prodigal son receives on his return to the heavenly Father's house (opimitate dominici corporis vescitur, eucharistia scilicet);[9] which Jesus Christ Himself sets before us in the bread He gives us.[10] Hence it is that Christians are anxious to let nothing of it fall on the ground,[11] and that those, whether priests or ordinary faithful, who handle it with hands that have made idols, torture the Lord's body.[1] The author adds that it is distributed by the leaders of the assembly,[2] though it can be preserved, to be consumed afterwards on fast days;[3] the Christian wives of heathen husbands take it secretly before any other food.[4] — As to the other two passages, *Adversus Marcionem*, IV, 40 and III, 9, that are contrary, it seems, to the doctrine of the real presence, they are easily explained, if we remark that our author sees even in unconsecrated and ordinary bread the figure of the flesh of Jesus Christ: "*Mittamus lignum in panem eius*" (*Jerem.*, 11[19]). — Finally we may observe that for him the Eucharist is not merely a Sacrament, but also a sacrifice,[5] which is offered on the anniversary of Martyrs and for the departed.[6]

---

[1] *De bapt.*, 1, 18; *Adv. Marc.*, I, 28.

[2] *De bapt.*, 15.

[3] *De bapt.*, 15. In this place Tertullian tells us that he had composed in Greek a special treatise on that topic; cf. *De pudicitia*, 19.

[4] *De bapt.*, 18.

[5] *De bapt.*, 17.

[6] *De bapt.*, 19.

[7] *De resurrectione carnis*, 8; *De bapt.*, 7, 8.

[8] *De resurrect. carnis*, 8.

[9] *De pudicitia*, 9.

[10] "Panem quo ipsum corpus suum repraesentat" (*Adv. Marcion.*, I, 14). As to the meaning of the word *repraesentare* in Tertullian, cf. GORE, *Dissertations on subjects connected with the Incarnation*, London, 1895, p. 310.

[11] *De corona*, 3.

Tertullian's penitential doctrine will be studied later on. On the question of marriage, his views had always been severe, until they became altogether heretical. Adultery is for him a legitimate motive of *repudium*, although it does not confer on the wife who is put away the right to remarry.[7] In his *Ad uxorem* (I, 1), written between the years 200–206, he comes out already quite strongly against second marriages. In his *De exhortatione castitatis* (1, 2, 5) composed between the years 208–211, he condemns them as a kind of adultery; while in the *De monogamia* (after the year 213), he opposes emphatically any compromise and maintains that the new law of the Paraclete has amended on this point the indulgence of the Gospel (1, 2, 14). — We may notice his important statement that in order to be held as undoubtedly legitimate, the marriage must be performed before the Church.[1]

---

[1] *De idololatria*, 7.

[2] *De corona*, 3.

[3] *De oratione*, 19.

[4] *Ad uxorem*, II, 5.

[5] *De oratione*, 19.

[6] *De corona*, 3.

[7] *De monogamia*, 9.

Moreover, our author's exaggerated severity on the question of second marriages is but one particular feature of that severity which permeates all his system of ethics. True, in theory, he distinguishes between precepts and counsels;[2] but when he comes to deal with the practical cases of conscience which Christians living in the midst of Pagans had every day to face and settle, he seems to forget this distinction and ordinarily requires nothing short of the extreme. Virgins must absolutely wear the veil (*De virginibus velandis*); Christians are forbidden to flee or to redeem themselves with money during the persecution (*De fuga in persecutione*); in the name of the Paraclete, we are obliged to fast often and rigorously (*De ieiunio adversus psychicos*). A Christian can neither serve in the army (*De corona*), nor be present at shows (*De spectaculis*). Likewise he is not allowed to exercise a profession tainted with idolatry; to sell anything that may be used for the worship of idols, unless he is sure that, as a matter of fact, what he sells shall not be used for that purpose; as a general rule, he is forbidden to be in trade, for cupidity is its aim, and lying, its means, and finally to fulfil a public function, imperial or municipal, because one thus circumstanced is always exposed to perform some deed of idolatry (*De idololatria*). In a word, Tertullian is anxious to introduce into the life of each one of the faithful an ideal both impracticable and unsound. The Christian he imagines, in order to remain such, ought to have ceased being a citizen and the member of a family; he ought to have banished himself from society. This would have been at the same time a justification of that charge of hatred of mankind, with which the Heathen assailed the followers of the new Creed.

---

[1] "Ideo penes nos occultae quoque coniunctiones, id est non prius apud ecclesiam professae, iuxta moechiam et fornicationem iudicari periclitantur" (*De pudicitia*, 4).

[2] *Ad uxor.*, II, 1: *Adv. Marcion.*, I, 29; II, 17; cf. I, 23.

Tertullian's eschatology remains to be examined. Its tone is quite archaic and realistic. If we except the souls of martyrs, which are immediately received into Heaven, the other souls, he says, go, like that of Christ, to Limbo, where they stay until the day of the resurrection.[1] There they are variously dealt with: "Supplicia iam illic et refrigeria."[2] Those of the just rejoice, for the good thoughts they had and the good actions they performed without the body's help; on the contrary, those of the wicked begin to suffer, for the evil they loved or accomplished. Even slight faults will be atoned for.[3] The dogma of the resurrection of the body is one of those our author has most strongly proved (*De carne Christi*, *De resurrectione carnis*). This resurrection, he observes, is necessary that man may be rewarded or punished, not merely for his interior intentions and dispositions, but also for his external and actual deeds.[4] Hence the very same flesh we had shall rise again, though in a new state: "Non abstulit (Deus) substantiam, cui similitudinem (angelorum) attribuit." "Resurget igitur caro, et quidem omnis, et quidem ipsa, et quidem integra."[5] On the other hand, this new life shall not be granted to all at the same moment. At the end of the present world, first the just shall rise, not indeed all together, but sooner or later according to their deserts, to reign a thousand years with Christ in the Jerusalem that will come down from Heaven.[1] Then, after that lapse of time, the world will be destroyed and, in their turn, the wicked rise for the judgment.[2] The just will taste forever the happiness of seeing God; the lost will remain "in poena aeque iugis ignis, habentes ex ipsa natura eius divinam scilicet administrationem incorruptibilitatis," for this fire will add new fuel to the chastisement itself.[3] Tertullian concludes his eschatology with a picture of the maddening fear which will take hold of the damned on the last day: a picture which seems to anticipate the medieval descriptions.[4]

---

[1] *De anima*, 55.

[2] *De anima*, 58.

[3] *De anima*, 58; *De resurrect. carnis*, 17. This last remark of Tertullian "Novissimum quadrantem modicum quoque delictum mora resurrectionis illic luendum interpretamur" (*De anima*, 58) shows clearly, as Harnack observes (*Lehrb. der D G.*, I, 570, note; *History of Dogma*, vol. II, p. 296, note), the belief in some kind of purgatory.

[4] *De resurrect. carnis*, 17.

[5] *De resurrect. carnis*, 62, 63.

We should not form a fair and complete idea of our author, if we were to judge him merely from his eschatology: but if we compare his teaching on this subject with that of Origen on the same topic, we may easily realize the distance that separates these two men: Origen, a genius, anxious to expand and to open before us intellectual horizons, fond chiefly of light and ready to frame systems; Tertullian, made up of precision and vigor, on principle abiding by the positive data of tradition and faith which he did not always understand — witness his Montanism — and eager above all to bring their contents home to us by the striking features of his thought and style.

§ 3. Novatian.[5]

At the time when St. Hippolytus was going into exile, in the year 235, he who was to become later on the heretic Novatian was beginning to be known in Rome. At first it may seem strange that we reckon him among the founders of Latin Theology. A disciple and imitator of Tertullian, he reproduced so faithfully the latter's doctrine and expressions that St. Jerome could say he had summed up the great controversialist;[1] and it is true that in those of his writings that have reached us, he does not show anything like originality. But his writings are the first which were composed in Latin at Rome on theological topics. The treatise *De Trinitate* especially, conceived as an explanation of the fundamental truths of the Symbol, is written with a care for order and method, which made it for a long time the model of works of the same kind. By its substance and form, it has exercised a considerable influence on the later Roman theology, and this is why its author may be reckoned among the pioneers of Western theology.[2]

---

[1] *Adv. Marcion.*, III, 24.

[2] *De spectaculis*, 30; *De anima*, 55.

[3] *Apologetic.*, 48.

[4] *De spectaculis*, 30; cf. P. Monceaux, *op. citat.*, I, p. 360.

[5] The edition quoted for the *De Trinitate* and the *De cibis iudaicis* is that of *P. L.*, III; for the letters, that of St. Cyprian, by W. Hartel. — Consult H. Jordan, *Die Theologie der neuentdeckten Predigten Novatians*, Leipsic, 1902.

The treatise *De cibis iudaicis* makes us acquainted with the attitude taken by Novatian in regard to the Old Law. He did not deny the literal meaning nor the obligatory character of its prescriptions as to the choice of the various kinds of food; but he discovered in those prescriptions a higher spiritual and allegorical meaning, and he saw most often in the Mosaic economy nothing but a system of shadows and figures which were to disappear at the coming of Jesus Christ.[3]

We must examine chiefly our author's Trinitarian doctrine. As Tertullian, Novatian starts in his exposition with the person of the Father. God is one (*De Trinitate*, 30).[1] God is the Father (30, 31); He is transcendent: "Maior est enim Deus mente ipsa, nec cogitari possit quantus sit." (2, cf. 7). All anthropomorphism is set aside (5, 6).

---

[1] *De viris illustr.*, 70. The word refers to the *De Trinitate* of Novatian: but instead of *summed up*, St. Jerome might have written with more exactness *developed* (cf. *P. L.*, III, col. 869, note 7).

[2] Novatian's writings are, besides the treatise *De Trinitate*, the pamphlet *De cibis iudaicis* and letters XXX and XXXVI among those of St. Cyprian. Moreover, several other works, to be spoken of later on, have been ascribed to him.

[3] *De cibis iudaicis*, 4.

Before the beginning of time and always, the Father possesses in Himself and begets His Son. That He eternally possessed Him in Himself, the Apologists and Tertullian admitted; that He begot Him from all eternity, Tertullian admitted only partially, since by distinguishing in God the conception from the generation properly so called, he did not ascribe to Him an eternal fatherhood. Novatian goes one step further. Though the Son, conceived and born eternally from the Father, remains in Him, yet this first birth suffices to make God Father from all eternity: "Hic ergo (Filius), cum sit genitus a Patre, semper est in Patre. Semper autem sic dico, ut non innatum sed natum probem . . . Semper enim in Patre, ne Pater non semper sit Pater" (31). However, this first generation must receive a complement. When He wills, viz., at the time of creation, God utters His Word: the latter is not merely born, He proceeds: He was *in* the Father, He becomes *with* the Father: "Ex quo (Patre), quando ipse voluit, sermo Filius natus est; . . . hic ergo, quando Pater voluit, processit ex Patre; et qui in Patre fuit, processit ex Patre; et qui in Patre fuit, quia ex Patre fuit, cum Patre postmodum fuit, quia ex Patre processit" (31).

Thus born and come from the Father, the Son is a second person, and as such, distinct from Him ("secundam personam efficiens post Patrem, qua Filius," 31, col. 950); besides, He is "substantia divina" (31, col. 950, A), God, as the Father (11–24, 31). There is between them a "communio substantiae" (31, col. 952, B). True, the Father is anterior to the Son, but it is only "qua Pater" (31, col. 949, B); just as the Son is a second person after the Father, only "qua Filius" (31, col. 950, A).

---

[1] All the following references between parentheses are taken, unless otherwise stated, from the treatise *De Trinitate.*

Here evidently Novatian comes as close as possible to the consubtantial: and yet, he does not discard, in his exposition, the subordinatian tendency he has found in that of Tertullian. He not only admits that personal subordination which results, in one way necessarily, for the Son, from the fact that His being is communicated to Him (31, col. 949, B C); moreover he declares that, unlike the Father, the Son is neither invisible nor incomprehensible (31, col. 950, B C): He it is that appeared in the theophanies, as an image of the Father, accommodated to the weakness of our eyes (18, cf. 19, 20); He obeys the Father in all things (61, col. 951, A B; 26); in a word He is inferior to the latter (27). This weak point of Novatian's teaching did not escape the notice of later theologians, and it is interesting to see in the *Conflictus Arnobii catholici et Serapionis* (I, 11),[1] some fragments of the 31st chapter of the *De Trinitate* quoted as the faithful expression of Arianism.

Concerning the Holy Spirit, our author reproduces the Biblical data. Nowhere does he call Him God. However, he makes Him the third term of the Trinity (29), ascribes to Him a divine eternity and a heavenly virtue (*divina aeternitas* — *caelestis virtus*, 29), and styles Him the "*illuminator rerum divinarum*" (16): but he subordinates Him to Christ: "minor autem Christo Paraclitus" (16, col. 915): the place of the Holy Ghost is between the Son from whom He receives, and creatures to whom He gives (*ibid.*).

As in his Trinitarian, so also in his Christological teaching, Novatian depends on Tertullian. We shall give a mere summary of what he says on Jesus Christ. The latter is truly man: His real body is neither ethereal nor sidereal, but taken *ex Maria* and born of her, therefore similar to ours, which He was to regenerate by His resurrection (10). On the other hand, Jesus Christ is God. He is then both God and man. "Tam enim Scriptura etiam Deum annuntiat Christum quam etiam hominem ipsum annuntiat Deum; tam hominem descripsit Jesum Christum quam etiam Deum quoque descripsit Christum Dominum" (11, 17). Novatian insists on this duality of elements. The expressions *assumpsit carnem, suscepit hominem, substantiam hominis induit,* etc., are those he usually employs to designate the Incarnation (13, 21, 22, 23). He mistrusts the formulas which ascribe to God the death and sufferings of Jesus, and takes the care to state them with more precision (25). One feels he is on his guard against adversaries. Opposing the Modalists who confound in Jesus the divine element with the Father, and the human nature with the Son, he observes that in Jesus the man is Son of God, not *naturaliter, principaliter,* but *consequenter,* viz., as a consequence of his union with the Word, that this filiation is in him something *feneratum, mutuatum* (24): which does not mean, however, that, according to our author, Jesus Christ, as man, is only the adopted Son of God, but that He is His Son only because of the union. The instant when the latter took place is not specified, and in spite of the lack of precision of some passages (24, col. 934, B; 13, col. 907, C), it would be unfair to charge Novatian with having postponed it till after the Saviour's conception.

---

[1] *P. L.*, LIII.

As a matter of fact, he fully acknowledges the personal unity of Jesus Christ, and although the expression *una persona* is not explicitly found in his works, yet its *equivalent* is found. The union of the humanity and of the divinity, he tells us, is a *permixtio* (11), an *annexio,* a *connexio et permixtio sociata,* a *transductio*; Jesus is *ex utroque connexus, contextus, concretus* (24); and this, he adds, was needed that Christ might be mediator: "ut . . . et Deum homini, et hominem Deo copularet" (23, cf. 21).

Almost all the *De Trinitate* of Novatian is devoted to the exposition of the doctrine of the Trinity and of the Incarnation. However he touches, in the same work, on a few other dogmatic points which it will suffice to mention. Thus he affirms man's freedom (1, col. 887, 888; 10, col. 903): the soul's divine origin and immortality (1, col. 887; 25, col. 935); the possibility for us to merit or to demerit ("praemia condigna et merita poenarum," 1, col. 888); the indefectibility and holiness of the Church: this Church is kept by the Holy Spirit "incorrupt and inviolate in the sanctity of a perpetual virginity and truth" (29, col. 946). Besides, with Tertullian, Novatian admits that the souls of the just and of the wicked go, after death, to a lower place where they taste the first fruits of their future judgment: "futuri iudicii praeiudicia sentientes" (1, col. 888).

Besides his undisputed works, some anonymous treatises, which are edited among the *spuria* of St. Cyprian,[1] and moreover are meagre in theological data, have been ascribed to Novatian with more or less probability: the *De spectaculis*, in which (5) there is a testimony on the Eucharist, the body of Christ; the *De bono pudicitiae*, an earnest exhortation to virginity; the *De laude martyrii*, which contains a realistic description of the everlasting punishments of Hell and of the happiness of Heaven (20, 21, cf. 11). We may mention also the *Adversus Iudaeos*. — Besides these rather short writings, several contemporary scholars (Weyman, Haussleiter, Zahn, H. Jordan) have expressed the opinion that Novatian was also the author of the twenty *Tractatus* recently discovered by Mgr. Batiffol, and published by him under the title of *Tractatus Origenis de libris SS. Scripturarum* (Paris, 1900). This view, however, is unfounded: the style of the *Tractatus* differs from that of Novatian, and their theology shows manifestly a considerable progress on that of the *De Trinitate.* Mgr. Batiffol thinks they are anterior to the peace of Constantine and are the work of some Novatianist who lived in the beginning of the fourth century; Harnack unhesitatingly assigns their composition to the time after the Council of Nicæa, and at the earliest to the end of the fourth century.[1]

---

[1] *S. Thasci Caecilii Cypriani opera omnia*, edit. W. Hartel, Vienna, 1868–1871, tom. III.

These remarks being made, we shall present here a short sketch of the doctrine developed in these *Tractatus.*[2]

God, represented as transcendent (I, p. 11, 24 — p. 12, 5; cf. I, p. 3, 18–19),[3] has created man. The latter is body and soul (I, p. 5, 25–27; cf. I, p. 4, 4–9, etc.); moreover in the Christian, faith adds a third element, the Spirit of God (I, p. 4, 4–8; p. 3, 25; XII, p. 135, 1–12; XX, p. 210, 25). Unfortunately, the sin of the first man has corrupted all things: "Peccavit Adam et corrupta sunt omnia" (VII, p. 77, 5; cf. V, p. 56, 9–11); all nations "conclusi sub peccato Adae et rei transgressionis atque obnoxii tenebantur" (V, p. 52, 5–8). Hence come death and all evils, the tyranny of sin and of the devil over the world and over man (XI, p. 123, 15–17; XIII, p. 147, 11–17; VII, p. 78, 5–11; X, p. 111, 13 — p. 112, 3, etc.). But God will replace man in the state where he was before his fall; He will grant him again to live always to God, to be immortal (I, p. 4, 12; XVII, p. 187, 17, ff.); He will make him God by means of grace (I, p. 9, 23, 24); and this work shall be an effect of His mercy, although man must necessarily concur therewith and may gain for himself by this coöperation a merit properly so called (I, p. 3, 22–24; p. 10, 10; p. 9, 23; p. 1, 4, 5).

---

[1] *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur, Die Chronologie,* II, p. 410.

[2] Cf. H. JORDAN, *Die Theologie der neuentdeckten Predigten Novatians,* Leipsic, 1902. P. BATIFFOL, *Les "Tractatus Origenis," à propos d'un livre nouveau,* in the *Revue Biblique,* 1903, pp. 81–93; and "*Pas Novatien*" in the *Bulletin de littérat. ecclésiastique,* 1900, pp. 283–297.

[3] In the following references, the Roman number designates the treatise; the Arabic numbers, the page of the edition, and the line.

The *Tractatus* do not contain the theory of the temporal generation of the Logos; on the other hand, they set forth, with a manifest progress in the formulas, the Trinitarian doctrine of Tertullian and Novatian. The use of the word *natura* instead of the word *substantia* may be particularly noticed. The Son was born from the Father, and consequently there is between them a personal distinction, with unity of nature: "Filius etenim Dei, Deus verus de Deo vero, unigenitus ab ingenito, non potest alius esse quam Deus" (III, p. 33, 19–20). "Pater et Filius indicantur, in quibus non natura dividitur, sed personae distinctae monstrantur" (VI, p. 67, 18). "Sicut enim ex leone leo nascitur, ita Deus de Deo et lumen ex lumine procedere dicitur. Sicut enim cum ex leone leo nascitur, non natura mutatur, sed una origo ostenditur, sic et Deus ex Deo natus aliud non potest esse quam Deus" (VI, p. 67, 20 — p. 68, 1). "Diximus leonem et catulum leonis Patrem et Filium indicare quorum una natura est geniti et ingeniti. Unde et ipse Salvator ait: Ego in Patre et Pater in me est. Sed alter in altero esse non potest nisi per naturae individuam unitatem" (VI, p. 68, 16–20; and cf. I, p. 9, 15 — p. 10, 17; III, p. 33, 5, 11, 14, 18; XIII, p. 148, 18, ff.). — Whether this unity of nature is, for the author, such as to do away with any inferiority on the part of the Son in regard to the Father, is not certain. In any case, Subordinationism appears very little (III, p. 33, 16–19; cf. VI, p. 67, 21; p. 68, 16–19): nay, our treatises contain a formula which proclaims the equality in power and virtue of the three Persons of the Trinity: "Nemo vincit nisi qui Patrem et Filium et Spiritum

Sanctum aequali potestate et indifferenti virtute crediderit" (XIV, p. 157, 11–13). As can be seen, this same text implicitly affirms the divinity of the Holy Ghost, whose "divina aeternitas" and "caelestis virtus" are also taught (XX, p. 210, 25, ff.), according to the corresponding passage of Novatian (*De Trinitate*, 29).

As the Trinitarian, so also the Christological doctrine of the *Tractatus* follows in the wake of that of Novatian and of Tertullian. The Word has put on a real flesh (XIV, p. 154, 12, ff.), a flesh which, although in itself and apart from the union, is defiled and sinful (XIX, p. 203, 1, 9, 17; p. 204, 7–9), is in Jesus Christ without any stain (XV, p. 164, 7; XIX, p. 203, 8). Jesus Christ is the son of the Patriarchs (VII, p. 80, 6, etc.); He was born of the Virgin Mary (VI, p. 68, 7, 8, 10; etc.), and received a human soul as we did (XVII, p. 184, 22–25).

Moreover, as He is also God, the Saviour combines in Himself two natures. True, our author nowhere wrote down the expression: "two natures:" but he speaks in various places of the divine *nature* (VI, p. 69, 4) and of the human *nature* (XIV, p. 154, 20, ff.) of Jesus Christ. The one is emphatically distinguished from the other, and what belongs properly to each one is set apart: "Timor non Dei sed suscepti hominis fuit" (XIV, p. 154, 12, ff.; VI, p. 59, 17, ff.; XIII, p. 149, 19; XVII, p. 184, 12). The words which express the union recall those of Novatian: *induit carnem, adsumpsit carnem, suscepit carnem hominis* (V, p. 49, 4, etc.; p. 51, 15; XVII, p. 184, 13, etc.).

Christ thus set forth is the second Adam (XVII, p. 184, 21; XX, p. 209, 22). The *similitudo Dei*, lost through sin, is again formed in Him. The idea of *recapitulatio* is in the author's mind, although he does not formally express it (IX, p. 99, 4). We have been saved by the second Adam. The *Tractatus* set forth the Redemption under a twofold aspect: first, as a repurchase properly so called: the blood of Jesus Christ is a price He pays for us, "praemio sui sanguinis nos a mortuis liberavit" (XVIII, p. 197, 18, ff.); then as a sacrifice and an expiation which Jesus Christ, priest and victim, having taken our sins on Himself, has fulfilled in our stead and for our benefit: "Sacerdos, inquam, hic noster . . . semetipsum in sacrificio dedit" (XIX, p. 206, 12, ff.). "Illic suspensus est dominus, ut peccata nostra . . . in ligno crucis per eumdem hominem affixa punirentur" (II, p. 15, 4, ff.; cf. p. 18, 17; IX, p. 102, 1; XIX, p. 204, 18).

As we said above, some scholars have thought that our author was probably a Novatianist. This conclusion is drawn from his insistence on setting forth the Church always as holy, pure and spotless (III, p. 25, 17; XX, p. 212, 5); on requiring from the Christian after Baptism a life without reproach and stain (I, p. 3, 17; VIII, p. 94, 6, etc.); on speaking of the severe, exact, austere "discipline" to which we ought to submit (VI, p. 71; XI, p. 126; XVI, p. 178, etc.); it is drawn chiefly from the passage where he seems to state that any canonical reconciliation is impossible to him who has become guilty of idolatry, incest, adultery, unnatural sins and murder (X, p. 112, 19, ff.). The absolute character of this last affirmation goes even beyond the strictness of early Novatianism and seems to show that the *Tractatus* were composed at a time when the heresy had made new steps in the way of rigorism.[1]

For the remainder of the teaching contained in the work, a few indications will suffice. An allusion to the Eucharist is found in the 2nd *Tractatus* (p. 18, 17). In the 17th *Tractatus*, we are told (p. 184, 6; p. 187, 11) that our resurrection "in eadem carne" is made sure by that of Jesus Christ; on the other hand, the dwelling-place of souls since the descent of

---

[1] Cf. the following chapter.

Jesus Christ to Limbo is not stated with precision; we read simply that the Patriarchs are in Heaven (XIV, p. 155, 8, ff.; cf. V, p. 51, 20, ff.; XVII, p. 183, 24 — p. 184, 4). As to the wicked, their punishments are only provisional until the last judgment (V, p. 52, 14, ff.).

CHAPTER X

THE QUESTION OF PENANCE IN THE WEST DURING THE THIRD CENTURY. NOVATIANISM

§ 1. The Question of Penance in Rome, under Callistus.[1]

FROM what precedes, one may see that, except Hermas, the authors of the second century supply on penance but scanty and vague information. Hermas speaks of it as an extraordinary favor granted to his contemporaries, a favor of which they should hasten to avail themselves, for it cannot be renewed either for individuals or for the Church. Besides, nobody is excluded from that penance and from the subsequent cure, except perhaps the apostates that blaspheme and inform against their brethren. — Likewise, apostates are not excluded from the communion of the Church, if we judge from the episode of the Martyrs of Lyons in 177, related by the letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne. Among the Christians that were seized, some weakened and denied their faith: but, instead of giving them up, those confessors who had remained faithful imparted to them their own spiritual goods, prayed the Heavenly Father for them and shed tears which He did not despise. They who had gone astray amended, and, even before their martyrdom, were reinstated in the Church (*τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ προσετέθησαν*). — On the other hand, however, St. Irenæus speaks of women who had been corrupted by Marcus and his disciples,[1] and some of whom, he says, confessing their crime, spent all their lives in public penitence; others, despairing of leading a godly life, left the Church altogether; others, finally, hesitated and did not know what determination to take:[2] a detail which seems to show that the penance for fornication had to last until death, and was so strict as to dishearten souls weak and of mediocre virtue.

---

[1] Sources: TERTULLIAN, *De paenitentia*, *De pudicitia*. *Philosophoumena*, IX, 12. — Works: E. PREUSCHEN, *Tertullians Schriften De pœnitentia und De pudicitia, mit Rücksicht auf Bussdisziplin untersucht*, Giessen, 1890. E. ROLFFS, *Das Indulgenz-Edict des römischen Bischofs Kallist Kritisch untersucht und reconstruiert*, Leipsic, 1893. P. BATIFFOL, *Etudes d'Histoire et de Théologie positive*, 1st series, 3rd edit., Paris, 1904.

This is about all that we know of the penitential discipline in the West during the first two centuries. But, from the very beginning of the third century, the subject becomes clearer. Tertullian has written two works on penance: one, the *De paenitentia*, which is an instruction destined to Catechumens, goes back to the years 200–206; the other, the *De pudicitia*, composed between the years 217 and 222, is a pamphlet aimed at Pope Callistus, on the occasion of a relaxation introduced by the latter into the discipline. Both make us fairly acquainted with the way in which this question was probably understood in Africa and in Rome, at the beginning of the third century, by Christians and especially by the author of these writings.

In the *De paenitentia*, Tertullian distinguishes two kinds of penance: the one, preparatory to Baptism, the other which, if necessary, is performed after Baptism. The former has for its purpose to place the soul in a state of purity without which the effect of the Sacrament could not be lasting (6, p. 655);[3]

---

[1] Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, V, I, 45, 48; II, 6, 7.

[2] *Adv. haereses*, I, 13, 5, 7.

[3] All the following references between parentheses designate, unless otherwise stated, the *De paenitentia*, edit. Œhler.

it must bear on all sins, both interior and exterior (4, p. 648); begun with fear, it is concluded by the sinner's amendment, the natural consequence of a true conversion (2, p. 645). — Regularly, this first penance should be followed by none other, since, once baptized, the Christian should not be guilty of any moral lapses. Unfortunately, such lapses *do* occur, and therefore there is for sinners a second plank of salvation, a second penance (7, p. 656). Otherwise God's threats as well as the Gospel parables could not be accounted for (8). Now this second penance is not performed simply in the heart; it implies a series of external acts which make up the public penance, and are described by Tertullian (9, pp. 659, 660).

The first is the confession of sins. Though the author does not say expressly to whom it belongs to receive it,[1] yet from the whole context, we may infer that this power belongs to the bishop or to his delegate. For the avowal must serve to determine the satisfaction imposed on the culprit — "quatenus satisfactio confessione disponitur" (9, p. 660), — a satisfaction that must be determined both in its rigor and its duration.[2] Now this satisfaction is preëminently a disciplinary measure which concerns the Christian community and is performed in its midst, and the nature and circumstances of which the bishop has the right to settle. — We may observe that Tertullian does not state anywhere whether the confession of sins is to be public. The satisfaction is to be public, and consequently the sinner's guilt also shall be made necessarily public in one way (10, p. 661); but of a public avowal, properly so called, no mention is made.

The satisfaction or expiation follows the avowal of sins, and constitutes the second act of penance. It is quite severe:

---

[1] The words "qua delictum domino confitemur" (*De paenit.*, 9, p. 660) are undetermined and vague: any avowal made to the bishop is, after all, made to God whom he represents.

[2] *De pudicitia*, 18, p. 834.

the penitent prostrates and humbles himself, sleeps on ashes, sets aside the ordinary means of cleanliness, feeds on bread and water, fasts, weeps, "mugit," devotes himself day and night to prayer, then, in the meeting of the faithful, drags himself to the feet of the priests, the confessors, the widows, all the brethren, humbly entreating them to intercede for him.[1] Tertullian affirms that in this way, the penitent offers to God a real satisfaction, appeases His wrath and is restored to the state from which he had fallen: "Paenitentia deus mitigatur . . . ut in peccatorem ipsa (paenitentia) pronuntians pro dei indignatione fungatur, et temporali afflictatione aeterna supplicia non dicam frustretur, sed expungat. Cum igitur provolvit hominem, magis relevat; cum squalidum facit, magis mundatum reddit: cum accusat, excusat; cum condemnat, absolvit."[2] Whence comes to the expiation its efficacy, the author does not say explicitly: he merely supposes that the tears and prayers of the faithful, in whom and by whom Christ weeps and prays for the guilty, move the heart of God: "Cum te ad fratrum genua protendis, Christum contrectas, Christum exoras. Aeque illi cum super te lacrimas agunt, Christus patitur, Christus patrem deprecatur. Facile impetratur semper quod filius postulat."[3]

The last act still remains to be performed: it crowns, as it were, what the satisfaction has begun: the bishop forgives the culprit ("veniam ab episcopo consequi poterit,"[4]) and reinstates him in ecclesiastical communion. The sinner enters again into the church, at the gate of which he was kneeling, and takes part in the common prayers and liturgy.[5]

---

[1] *De paenit.*, 9, p. 660; *De pudicitia*, 13, pp. 817, 818.

[2] *De paenit.*, 9, pp. 660, 661.

[3] *De paenit.*, 10, p. 661.

[4] *De pudicitia*, 10, p. 834.

[5] *De pudicitia*, 3, p. 797; 7, p. 806; 13, p. 820; *De paenit.*, 7, p. 657; cf. *Apologetic.*, 39, p. 257.

In his *De paenitentia*, Tertullian says nothing of this power of absolving vested in the bishop: but, as we shall see later on, he treats of it expressly in his *De pudicitia*.

Thus understood and described, the exomologesis or penance is not for Tertullian what it was for Hermas, viz., an extraordinary and transient concession: it is a permanent institution, although each sinner can avail himself of it only once in his life. On this point Tertullian is explicit, and he probably records the discipline that was then in vigor: "Piget secundae, immo iam ultimae spei subtexere mentionem. . . . Collocavit in vestibulo paenitentiam quae pulsantibus patefaciat, sed iam semel quia iam secundo; sed amplius nunquam, quia proxime frustra." [1] If then the sinner falls again after his reconciliation by the bishop, the Church does not allow him to take up again the exercises of penance. These should be performed, publicly and officially, only once.[2]

This is a first and important restriction: here is another. There are three kinds of sins which, of course, must be confessed and for which satisfaction must be made, but the forgiveness of which the Church herself does not grant and reserves to God: apostasy, fornication or adultery, and murder. Although Tertullian mentions this exception only in his *De pudicitia*, on the occasion of the decree of Callistus, it is evident, from what he says of it, that the exception was made at Rome and in Africa before that decree and that, at the time when he was writing, it was still maintained there as regards murder and apostasy.[3] We ought to distinguish, he observes, two kinds of sins: some pardonable; others impardonable; some *non ad mortem*, others *ad mortem*, according to St. John (1 *John*, 5^{16}).[4] The former — of which he gives instances —

---

[1] *De paenit.*, 7, pp. 656, 657.

[2] Tertullian does not speak at all of private penance and absolution.

[3] *De pudicitia*, 5, p. 800.

[4] *De pudic.*, 2, p. 796.

can be forgiven by the bishop and "per exoratorem patris Christum;"[1] among the latter, Tertullian includes "homicidium, idololatria, fraus, negatio, blasphemia, utique et moechia et fornicatio, et si qua alia violatio templi dei,"[2] although in practice the list was made up only of idolatry (or apostasy), fornication (or adultery) and murder.[3] For these sins, he remarks, penance must be made: however, their forgiveness is in the hands of God alone: "Haec enim erit paenitentia quam et nos deberi quidem agnoscimus multo magis, sed de venia deo reservamus."[4] He who has become guilty of them can and must groan and bemoan himself; and yet the Church will not replace him in the *communicatio ecclesiastica;*[5] Christ, whose prayer brings about the ordinary sinner's reconciliation, will not pray for him: "horum ultra exorator non erit Christus."[6] Not that this penance is to be useless and unprofitable: on the contrary, by performing it, the culprit renders to God the beginning or seed of forgiveness: that peace which the Church will not restore him here below, God Himself will give him back one day.[7] Still, after all, it remains true that during his life he will not obtain his reconciliation from the Church.

Is it because the Church has not the power to remit that kind of sins? Even after his becoming a Montanist, Tertullian does not absolutely refuse her that power.[8] With greater reason, the true Church and the Pope shall claim it for themselves, as we shall see later on. If then they do not use it, it is because they think it inopportune to do so. Their abstention is an ecclesiastical and disciplinary abstention, not one imposed by divine law. The decree of Callistus, of which a few words now have to be said, shows this conclusively.

---

[1] *De pudic.*, 18, p. 834; 19, p. 838.
[2] *De pudic.*, 19, p. 838.
[3] *De pudic.*, 5, p. 800.
[4] *De pudic.*, 19, p. 835.
[5] *De pudic.*, 1, p. 794; 18, p. 834; 19, p. 835.
[6] *De pudic.*, 19, p. 838.
[7] "Et si pacem hic non metit, apud dominum seminat. Nec amittet, sed praeparat fructum. Non vacabit ab emolumento, si non vacaverit ab officio" (*De pudic.*, 3, p. 797).
[8] *De pudic.*, 21, pp. 842, 843.

It is easy to understand the painful situation in which renegades, fornicators and murderers were placed by the discipline just described. Penitents, they had to remain such all their lives, without any hope to reënter the communion of the Church. Many weak souls were probably disheartened at such a prospect, and neglected a penance which seemed to come short of its purpose. This was likely — for we do not know the exact circumstances in which it took place — the reason which at the beginning of the third century, brought into the discipline a mitigation of which Pope Callistus was the author.

The decree which promulgated this relaxation is known to us only through Tertullian and perhaps through the author of the *Philosophoumena*. According to the former, it enacted in substance that henceforth fornicators and adulterers should undergo only a temporary penance, and, after its accomplishment, might, like ordinary sinners, be absolved and restored to the communion: "Adimi quidem peccatoribus, sed maxime carne pollutis communicationem, sed ad praesens, restituendam scilicet ex paenitentiae ambitu, secundum illam clementiam dei quae mavult peccatoris paenitentiam quam mortem."[1] Callistus himself gave them the absolution of their faults: "Ego et moechiae et fornicationis delicta paenitentia functis dimitto;"[2] and while, to justify the opportunity of his measure, he recalled various reasons drawn from Scripture, in order to prove its authoritative character, he alleged merely the power of the keys entrusted to St. Peter and communicated to his successors: "Super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam, tibi dabo claves regni caelestis, vel quaecumque alligaveris vel solveris in terra erunt alligata vel soluta in caelis . . . Idcirco praesumis et ad te derivasse solvendi et alligandi potestatem, id est ad omnem ecclesiam Petri propinquam."[1]

---

[1] *De pudic.*, 18, pp. 833, 834.

[2] *De pudic.*, 1, p. 792.

Moreover, the Pope acknowledged in martyrs or confessors a similar power of reconciliation.[2] In what did this power exactly consist? Tertullian speaks of it, as if the martyrs could, without the bishop's intervention, purely and simply absolve the culprit and reinstate him in the communion.[3] However, it seems strange that at Rome, — where, as we shall say later on, the confessors were denied almost any qualification in the reconciliation of the *lapsi*, — such a great privilege should have been acknowledged as theirs, under Callistus. Probably, Tertullian's words are not to be taken literally, and the power in question seems to be simply the faculty of granting to sinners letters of recommendation and communion, which had to be ratified by the bishop.

Finally, the Pope's decree probably contained a last provision, mentioned by the *Philosophoumena:*[4] in case that bishops, priests and deacons should commit one of the three faults *ad mortem*, they were not to be deposed from their charge: *Εἰ ἐπίσκοπος ἁμάρτοι τι, εἰ καὶ πρὸς θάνατον, μὴ δεῖν κατατίθεσθαι* (IX, 12). This measure had been taken no doubt, to safeguard in the eyes of the faithful the dignity of the ecclesiastical order. Actually it suppressed public penance for the clergy.

---

[1] *De pudic.*, 21, p. 843.

[2] *De pudic.*, 22, pp. 844–846.

[3] "Alii ad metalla confugiunt et inde communicatores revertuntur . . . Christus in martyre est, ut moechos et fornicatores martyr absolvat" (*De pudic.*, 22, pp. 845, 846).

[4] The treatise of Tertullian *De pudicitia*, perhaps mutilated at the end, does not mention it.

These were the contents of Callistus' decree, as far as we can judge. It was a measure of timely condescension: the Pope's enemies represented it as the expression of a laxity beyond forgiveness and a genuine usurpation of power. Tertullian not only recriminates, he disputes; he calls into question not only the wisdom of the act, but also the Pope's authority to enact it. No doubt, as well as any other bishop, Callistus has the right to absolve the *leviora delicta* — a power which his adversary acknowledges implicitly,[1] — but he cannot remit the *delicta mortalia.*[2] The words said to Peter, Tertullian continues, were for him alone and cannot be extended in general to his successors.[3] God alone can remit sins, and although He has imparted this power to the Church, yet He has done it with this restriction, that she should not use it for the sins *ad mortem:* "Potest ecclesia donare delictum, — the Spirit says, — sed non faciam ne et alia delinquant."[4] In any case, supposing that the Church should exercise that power, she would do it, not through Episcopacy and the official hierarchy, but through those spiritual men to whom the Holy Ghost might grant the charism and gift thereof: "Et ideo ecclesia quidem delicta donabit, sed ecclesia spiritus per spiritalem hominem, non ecclesia numerus presbyterorum. Domini erim, non famuli est ius et arbitrium, dei ipsius, non sacerdotis."[5] It seems that by these last words, the Montanist Tertullian withdraws what he has first allowed, and sees in that power to absolve, not a regular function of Episcopacy, but the effect of a special charism granted to a certain élite.

---

[1] *De pudicitia,* 18, p. 834.

[2] By these two words *leviora* and *mortalia,* we should understand not the venial and mortal sins, as we distinguish them now, but the sins *non ad mortem* and *ad mortem.*

[3] *De pudic.,* 21, p. 843.

[4] *De pudic.,* 21, pp. 842, 843.

[5] *De pudic.,* 21, p. 844.

As to martyrs, Tertullian denies them any power to absolve sinners and to restore them to the ecclesiastical communion. They could do it, he observes, only by dying for them, through a *substitutio vicaria*, as Jesus Christ died for us; and this is impossible.[1] Personal martyrdom alone, — in as much as it is a second Baptism, — can purify and reconcile the culprit.[2]

Tertullian and the author of the *Philosophoumena* were not the only ones to resist at first the disciplinary change introduced by Callistus. We see from a letter of St. Cyprian (LV, 21), that several African bishops continued for some time to refuse forgiveness to fornicators and adulterers. Others on the contrary accepted the mitigation, and the Church of Africa was divided. However, this division did not last, for the Bishop of Carthage speaks of it as a thing of the past. The time was to come when the discipline was to be made still less rigorous, and the indulgence granted for the sins of the flesh, extended to apostasy.

§ 2. — The Question of Penance in Africa. Novatianism.[3]

This new mitigation was brought about by the persecution of Decius. That persecution, which began towards the end of the year 249 or at the beginning of the year 250, caused in the African Church numerous and deplorable defections. Many Christians, listening to the Emperor's commands, actually sacrificed to idols (*sacrificati*); others, to protect themselves, bought with money or obtained from some commissaries' obliging kindness, certificates attesting that they had sacrificed, although they had not done so: these were called *libellatici*.

---

[1] *De pudic.*, 22, p. 846.

[2] *De pudic.*, 22, p. 846.

[3] Sources: The letters of St. Cyprian, edit. HARTEL. The anonymous treatise *Ad Novatianum*, in the edition of St. Cyprian, by HARTEL, vol. III, or *P. L.*, III. — Works: The works on Novatian and on St. Cyprian, and particularly: C. GÖTZ, *Die Busslehre Cyprians*, Königsberg, 1895. K. MÜLLER, *Die Bussinstitution in Karthago unter Cyprian*, in the *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.*, XVI, 1895–1896. P. BATIFFOL, *Etudes d'Histoire et de Théologie positive*, 1st series, 3rd edit., Paris, 1904. L. CHABALIER, *Les Lapsi dans l'Eglise d'Afrique au temps de saint Cyprien*, Lyons, 1904.

However, as early as towards the end of 250, there was a relaxing of rigor in the persecution of Christians. Before the perfect calming of the storm, *lapsi*, of various categories, flocked to the confessors and martyrs, to get from them letters of communion (*libelli pacis*), which they might present to the priests and thus be immediately reconciled to the Church. Now, while among the confessors some were worthy of admiration, others too were more or less trustworthy and of a doubtful prudence: they distributed indiscriminately these letters of reconciliation, and aimed at usurping the bishop's power, or at least at compelling him to follow their own views in the line of conduct to be adopted in regard to apostates.

It was then that St. Cyprian intervened. Although driven from his Church by the persecution (250 — spring of 251), he still continued to rule it by means of his letters. Two questions came up before his mind: first, could the Church and should the Church absolve the *lapsi* from the crime of apostasy, as Callistus had absolved adulterers and fornicators, and on what conditions? Then what authority and what part in this work of reconciliation were to be assigned to the martyrs and confessors?

In the letters written from his exile, St. Cyprian does not treat *ex professo* the first question: he postpones its full solution to the future when religious peace will allow proper reflection and consideration.[1] He hints, however, that he regards the reconciliation of the *lapsi* as possible and perhaps timely: he warns the priests and deacons to keep up and rekindle in the guilty trust in God's mercy.[1] Nay, he determines that if a *lapsus* has received from the martyrs a letter of communion and is in danger of death, he shall, without waiting for the bishop's return, make public penance before a priest, or in the absence of a priest before a deacon; and that hands shall be laid upon him that he may go to God in that peace the martyrs have asked for him.[2] But what St. Cyprian does not accept, nay, what he absolutely condemns is that on the mere recommendation of the martyrs and on the mere sight of their letter of reconciliation, without any previous penance, without exomologesis and laying of the bishop's hand, the *lapsi* that are in good health should be admitted to communion.[3] He looks upon this as an abuse which he cannot tolerate.

---

[1] *Ep.* XV.

As to the martyrs' rights in this matter he acknowledges only one, viz., that of recommending the *lapsi* to the bishop and of begging for their reinstatement; but they cannot require and still less perform themselves that reconciliation.[4] Moreover he wishes that in their *libelli pacis* they mention not whole groups of persons, but distinct individuals, designated by name, that have already made a penance almost sufficient.[5]

Of course, these decisions of the Bishop of Carthage, although provisional, failed to please a certain number of those whom they concerned. Some confessors became more haughty than ever;[1] the *lapsi* claiming their reconciliation no more as a favor, but as a right, stirred up in some cities real riots, and found some members of the clergy who pushed kindness so far as to support their pretensions.[2] St. Cyprian had to recall that it belonged to bishops to rule the Church.[3] At the same time, he wrote to the Roman clergy, then without a bishop since the martyrdom of St. Fabian (January 20, 250), laying before them his own view of the subject, and asking them to give it their support by embracing it themselves.[4]

---

[1] *Ep.* XVIII, 2.

[2] *Ep.* XVIII, 1.

[3] "Nam cum in minoribus peccatis agant peccatores paenitentiam iusto tempore, et secundum disciplinae ordinem ad exomologesim veniant, et per manus impositionem episcopi et cleri ius communicationis accipiant, nunc, crudo tempore, persecutione adhuc perseverante, nondum restituta ecclesiae ipsius pace, ad communicationem admittuntur, et offertur nomine eorum, et nondum paenitentia acta, nondum exomologesi facta, nondum manu eis ab episcopo et clero imposita, eucharistia illis datur, cum scriptum sit: Qui ederit panem aut biberit calicem Domini indigne reus erit corporis et sanguinis Domini" (*Ep.* XVI, 2; cf. *Ep.* XV, 1).

[4] *Ep.* XV, 1; cf. XVII, 1.

[5] *Ep.* XV, 4.

The answer of the Roman clergy, which was drawn up by Novatian, was in keeping with St. Cyprian's wishes. It is the XXXth letter.[5] It stated that the line of conduct followed at Rome in regard to the *lapsi* was like that of the Bishop of Carthage. The guilty were not abandoned to themselves, but the utmost was done to make them realize the serious nature of their fault, and penance was required from them (6). For those who were in peril of death, after fulfilling as much as possible the exomologesis, they were helped "caute et sollicite, Deo ipso sciente quid de talibus faciat, et qualiter iudicii sui examinet pondera, nobis tamen anxie curantibus ut nec pronam nostram improbi homines laudent facilitatem, nec vere paenitentes accusent nostram quasi duram crudelitatem" (8). Another letter of the same clergy tells us, moreover, that communion was granted to them.[6] As to the confessors and martyrs they were themselves refused the privilege to reconcile the *lapsi;*[1] they were allowed at most earnestly to beg peace for them.

---

[1] *Ep.* XXIII.

[2] *Ep.* XVI, 1, 2; XX, 3; XXVII, 3; XXIX, 1–3; XXXV.

[3] *Ep.* XXXIII, 1.

[4] *Ep.* XX, 3; XXVII.

[5] Cf. *Ep.* LV, 5.

[6] *Ep.* VIII, 2.

So, Novatian and his colleagues approved on the whole St. Cyprian's views.[2] These were solemnly sanctioned by the Council which met at Carthage in April 251, after the Bishop's return, and was attended by many prelates.[3] The following decisions were adopted. The *libelli pacis* granted by the martyrs would be taken into no account, and the case of each one of the *lapsi*, examined individually.[4] The *libellatici* had to be distinguished from the *sacrificati*. The former, less guilty, would be admitted to reconciliation one by one.[5] The latter had to do penance all their lifetime; but they would be reconciled at the time of death so that they might depart from this world with the consolation of peace and communion: "illis, sicut placuit, subvenitur."[6] "Sacrificatis in exitu subveniri . . . cum solacio pacis et communicationis abscedit."[7] Not indeed that the Bishop thus intended to determine and settle beforehand God's judgment: for He Himself would decide whether or not the penance had been sufficient and earnest, and would confirm or modify the sentence of the Church.[8] As to those who refused to perform the exomologesis, they should not be reconciled even at the approach of death, although they asked it then: for it is probable that fear alone, and not sorrow, prompted them to act.[1] Finally the clerics, bishops, priests, or deacons who were *lapsi* would be deposed, and thus being brought down to the rank of the laity, they would pass through the exercises of ordinary penance, without any hope of being reinstated in their charge:[2] a decision, observes St. Cyprian, which had been taken by Pope Cornelius and the bishops of the whole world.[3]

---

[1] *Ep.* XXVI, 2.

[2] Let it be remarked, though, that in the Roman letter (1) no mention is made of the imposition of the hand for the reconciliation of the *lapsi:* a silence from which we cannot infer that the rite was not practised; (2) the reliance placed on the efficacy of the forgiveness granted by the Church is less than in Africa (we should not forget that it is Novatian, a rigorist, who acts as secretary); (3) finally, less importance is attached to the privilege of the martyrs.

[3] *Ep.* LV, 6.

[4] *Ep.* LV, 6, 13, 17.

[5] *Ep.* LV, 14–17: "examinatis causis singulorum, libellaticos interim admitti" (*ibid.*, 17).

[6] *Ep.* LV, 13.

[7] *Ep.* LV, 17.

[8] *Ep.* LV, 18.

The Council which enacted these measures came to a close in June 251. But the malcontents were already organized. They had assembled around the priest Novatus and the deacon Felicissimus, both strongly opposed to St. Cyprian.[4] Excommunicated by the latter,[5] Novatus went to Rome and became a friend of the priest Novatian who was apparently to succeed, as Bishop of Rome, the martyr Fabian: however, his hope was not fulfilled: Cornelius was chosen (March 5, 251). This exasperated Novatian who gathered some priests and a certain number of the faithful and of the confessors; Novatus worked in the same direction; and a schism broke out. Novatian was consecrated bishop by three dissenting prelates and began to organize his church.[6]

From what precedes, we might expect that Novatian's party should, under the influence of Novatus, declare itself for an indulgence in regard to the *lapsi* greater than that of St. Cyprian and of his Council. The very contrary happened. Novatian was inclined to rigoristic views — of which we find traces in the XXXth letter written by him — and imposed them on his followers. He declared that it was unlawful to hold intercourse with the Heathen, viz., the *lapsi*; that no penance should be granted to them, nor, supposing they would perform spontaneously its exercises, should they get forgiveness, even at the time of death;[1] that besides, such a penance was useless and could not save them, since for them there was no more hope of peace and mercy.[2] Thus Novatian taught that apostasy was a sin which the Church cannot, and which God Himself apparently does not, forgive; and yet, he does not seem to have gone back to the past nor to have called into question the legitimacy of the pardon granted to the *moechi*, since St. Cyprian draws therefrom an argument against him in his LVth letter, 20, 26, 27.

---

[1] *Ep.* LV, 23.
[2] *Ep.* LXVII, 6; cf. LIX, 10.
[3] *Ep.* LXVII, 6; cf. EUSEBIUS, *Hist. eccles.*, VI, 43, 10.
[4] *Ep.* XLI, 1; XLIII, 1, 2; LII, 2; LIX, 1, 9.
[5] *Ep.* XLII; cf. XLI, 1.
[6] *Ep.* LV, 24.

Novatian's error had been condemned beforehand in the Council of Carthage: it was the object of another condemnation in the Council of Rome, held in the fall of the year 251, which was attended, according to Eusebius (*Hist. eccles.*, VI, 43, 2), by sixty bishops. The antipope was excommunicated.

The whole Christian world, with a few exceptions, acquiesced in that condemnation.[3] But Novatian exerted himself in such a way that he was successful in holding his ground and in founding in a great many places Christian communities that shared his error. They continued to subsist for a long time and lived side by side with the Catholic communities, like them having their own hierarchy of bishops, priests and deacons, often sharing in their persecutions for the faith and differing from them only on the question of penance.

Moreover, Novatian's followers seem soon to have pushed much further than their leader himself the consequences of his rigorism. As we have seen, though the latter denied forgiveness to the *lapsi*, still he granted it to the fornicators and adulterers. The day came when, persecutions having either ceased or at least abated, there were no more apostates, and when, consequently, the schism had no longer a reason of existence. However, efforts continued to be made to justify it, by giving emphasis to its tendencies and declaring that all the sins *ad mortem*, fornication and murder included, were beyond the Church's power of reconciliation. We may infer this apparently from the *Tractatus Origenis* (X, p. 112, 19, ff.), and certainly from the treatise *De paenitentia* (I, 2, 5; 3, 10) of St. Ambrose, the letters of St. Pacian to Sympronian,[1] and the *Quaestiones ex veteri et novo Testamento* of the Pseudo-Augustine.[2] St. Pacian sums up the doctrine of the Novatianists in these few words: "Quod post baptismum paenitere non liceat, quod mortale peccatum Ecclesia donare non possit, immo quod ipsa pereat recipiendo peccantes."[3] The testimonies of Philastrius (*De haeresibus*, 82), St. Augustine (*De haeresibus*, 38), Socrates (*Hist. eccles.*, I, 10; VII, 25), Theodoret (*Haeretic. fabul.*, III, 5) and St. Nilus (*Epist.*, lib. III, 243) agree with these statements.

---

[1] *Ep.* LV, 22, 27.

[2] *Ep.* LV, 22; EUSEB., *Hist. eccles.*, VI, 43, 1; the anonymous treatise *Ad Novatianum*, 12, 13.

[3] ST. CYPRIAN, *Ep.* LXVIII, 2; EUSEB., *Hist. eccles.*, VI, 44, 1; 46, 3, 4; VII, 5, 1.

However, besides the historical details with which the controversies just exposed supply us as to the discipline of penance, there arose also two advantages from a dogmatic standpoint: on one hand, a more distinct realization on the part of the Church of her power to forgive always and everywhere all kinds of sins — she had herself limited for a while the use of that power; she widened, in due time, the exercise of the same power; — on the other hand, the clear view that the ecclesiastical hierarchy alone is the depositary of that power, and is amenable to itself and to itself alone, for the application of it which it thinks opportune to make. This hierarchy had already triumphed in the affirmation of its rights, over the pretensions of speculation and illuminism embodied respectively in Gnosticism and in Montanism; now it triumphed over those of pseudo-sanctity represented by some confessors and by the partisans of an exaggerated rigorism. A bishop had appeared, who combined in an uncommon degree with the gift of ruling, the consciousness of his authority, and who had pledged all his energy and learning to secure that triumph. His name, as we have seen, was Cyprian.

---

[1] *P. L.*, XIII, col. 1063.

[2] *P. L.*, XXXV, col. 2307.

[3] *Ep.* III, 1, *P. L.*, XIII, col. 1063.

CHAPTER XI

ST. CYPRIAN AND THE BAPTISMAL CONTROVERSY

§ 1. — St. Cyprian's Theology.[1]

St. Cyprian is not a speculator, nor a theologian properly so called: of all theological notions, that of the Church is about the only one he has somewhat deeply investigated: even in this, he is not altogether original. As has been just noticed, he is chiefly a man of government and action, a bishop of the type which St. Ambrose and St. Leo are one day to reproduce, going into doctrinal difficulties only in as much as the instruction of the people demands it, and watching above all to keep up peace in the minds, that all the energies of the soul may be concentrated on interior reform. Although an admirer and a disciple of Tertullian, he is as calm and well-balanced as his master is excessive and violent. His eloquence is clothed as with the toga and always preserves something solemn and stately. Yet, precisely because of that strong and calm self-possession, his influence on his contemporaries and on the whole Church of old was immense. As the see of Rome was "the see of Peter," so also that of Carthage was, in the fourth century, "the see of Cyprian."[1] The peculiar spirit of Rome and of the West displayed itself in that practical genius and in that extraordinary skill for the direction of men.

---

[1] The edition quoted is that of W. Hartel, *S. Thasci Caecilii Cypriani opera omnia*, Vienna, 1868–1871. — Works: P. Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, II, Paris, 1902. H. Leclercq, *L'Afrique chrétienne*, I, Paris, 1904. E. Wh. Benson, *Cyprian, his life, his times, his work*, London, 1897. K. G. Götz, *Das Christentum Cyprians*, Giessen, 1896. O. Ritschl, *Cyprian von Karthago und die Verfassung der Kirche*, Göttingen, 1885. J. Delarochelle, *L'idée de l'Eglise dans Saint Cyprien*, in the *Revue d'Hist. et de Littér. religieuses*, I, 1896. K. H. Wirth, *Der Verdienst Begriff in der christlichen Kirche*, II, *Der Verdienst Begriff bei Cyprian*, Leipsic, 1901. P. Batiffol, *L'Eglise Naiss. et le Catholicisme*, 1909, pp. 399–483; especially pages 458 and foll.

We may pass by the Trinitarian views of St. Cyprian, and even the few Christological indications which he has grouped in the second book of his *Testimonia ad Quirinum* (1, 3, 6, 8–11, 14) and which reproduce substantially Tertullian's teaching. His soteriology is also rather undeveloped: although the notion of *substitutio vicaria* is set forth,[2] and the author has drawn a striking description[3] of the effects of Redemption. The true centre of his theology is the doctrine of the Church.

Considered in her visible elements, the Church, St. Cyprian tells us, is the gathering of the bishop and his flock, of the bishop, the clergy and the faithful.[4] Considered in her mystical state, she is the spouse of Jesus Christ to whom she must give spiritual children.[5] Her function consists in being the depositary of the heavenly blessings, of the grace, of the treasures brought by Redemption, and at the same time of the sanctifying power of Jesus Christ, so that these can be found in none but in her.[6] Hence the necessity to belong to that Church. Whosoever departs from her "vitam non tenet et salutem;"[7] whosoever rejects her rejects Christ whose spouse she is.[8] "Habere non potest Deum patrem qui ecclesiam non habet matrem."[1] She is the ark in which alone we can be saved and purified.[2]

---

[1] St. Optatus, II, 10.
[2] *De lapsis*, 17; *Epist.* I, 5.
[3] *De opere et eleemosynis*, 1.
[4] *Epp.* LXVI, 8; XXXIII, 1.
[5] *De cathol. eccles. unit.*, 4–6; *Ep.* LXXIV, 6.
[6] *Epp.* LXXIII, 7, 10, 11; LXXI, 1.
[7] *De cathol. eccles. unit.*, 6; *Ep.* LXIX, 4.
[8] *Ep.* III, 1.

The fundamental character of the Church thus conceived is unity. St. Cyprian wrote a whole treatise — the *De catholicae ecclesiae unitate* — to prove and explain it. The true Church, he observes, is one, because there cannot be several true Churches.[3] But she is above all internally one, because among her members, pastors and faithful, there must be the bond of common faith, of common charity, and also that of the subjection of the faithful to the pastors.[4] This unity is typified by the seamless robe of Jesus Christ;[5] by the unity of the Eucharistic bread and wine made up of the multitude of the grains of wheat and of the grapes that have respectively produced them;[6] it is pointed out chiefly by our Lord building that Church from the very beginning on Peter alone, and then bestowing first on Peter alone the power He was later on to grant to the other Apostles, to make known to us, by this symbolic action, the unity He intended to have in His Church: "Super unum aedificat ecclesiam, et quamvis apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat . . . tamen, ut unitatem manifestaret, unitatis eiusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate disposuit. . . . Exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, ut ecclesia Christi una monstretur."[7] To reject that unity is to reject faith, the faith of the Father and of the Son, the law of God, salvation; it is to be a stranger, a profane, an enemy.[8] It behooves especially the bishops to preserve and maintain it among themselves, in order to show that Episcopacy is one and undivided (ut episcopatum quoque ipsum unum atque indivisum probemus),[1] and also because the unity of the Church results from union among them and with them: . . . "quando ecclesia quae catholica una est scissa non sit neque divisa, sed sit utique connexa et cohaerentium sibi invicem sacerdotum glutino copulata."[2]

---

[1] *De cathol. eccles. unit.*, 6.

[2] *Epp.* LXIX, 2; LXXIV, 11; cf. *Firmilian's Letter*, LXXV, 15.

[3] *De cathol. eccles. unit.*, 4.

[4] *De unit.*, 6, 8, 10, 12.

[5] *De unit.*, 7.

[6] *Epp.* LXIII, 13; LIX, 5.

[7] *De unit.*, 4; *Epp.* LXXIII, 7; LIX, 14.

[8] *De unit.*, 4, 6.

This Church, as we have seen, includes the bishop, a clergy and the faithful; but she is built upon the bishops, and they it is that rule and govern her: such is the divine ordinance: "Inde per temporum et successionum vices episcoporum ordinatio et ecclesiae ratio decurrit ut ecclesia super episcopos constituatur, et omnis actus ecclesiae per eosdem praepositos gubernetur. . . . Cum hoc ita divina lege fundatum sit, miror, etc."[3] Each particular Church is, as it were, summed up in her bishop, so that when one ceases to be with him, he ceases to be in the Church: "Unde scire debes episcopum in ecclesia esse et ecclesiam in episcopo, et si qui cum episcopo non sit in ecclesia non esse."[4] Bishops are the successors of the Apostles: the latter were the bishops of old, and the present bishops are the Apostles of to-day: "apostolos, id est episcopos:"[5] and just as the Apostles formed only one Apostolic college, and only one Apostolic power was shared by all *in solidum*, so also all bishops taken together form only one body, and there is only one Episcopate, of which all the members of Episcopacy partake: "Episcopatus unus est cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur;"[6] and if one of them comes short of his task, the others must come to the rescue of his flock.[7]

---

[1] *De unit.*, 5; *Ep.* XLV, 3.

[2] *Ep.* LXVI, 8.

[3] *Ep.* XXXIII, 1; cf. *Epp.*, III, 3; XLVIII, 4; LV, 8; LXVI, 1, 8.

[4] *Ep.* LXVI, 8.

[5] *Epp.* III, 3; XLV, 3; cf. *Firmilian's Letter*, LXXV, 16, and the *Sententiae episcoporum*, 79.

[6] *De unit.*, 3; *Ep.* LXVIII, 3.

[7] *Ep.* LXVIII, 3.

Thus it is that St. Cyprian conceives the Church: viz., as a vast society, one in her faith, and ruled by a senate of bishops making up only one body. Moreover, does he assign a leader to those bishops? Does he ascribe a head to that senate? Does he admit a higher authority which establishes and preserves that unity of which he is so anxious? In a word, does he acknowledge in the bishop of Rome a primacy of jurisdiction among and over his colleagues?

There is no doubt that, on the occasion of the Baptismal controversy, Pope Stephen did claim for himself that primacy as St. Peter's successor and acted as the bishop of bishops. Even against many Councils, he required obedience under pain of excommunication.[1] Some modifications introduced into the primitive text of the *De catholicae ecclesiae unitate* might perhaps prove that St. Cyprian acknowledged on the whole the legitimate character of these pretensions of the bishop of Rome, were it shown conclusively — as some have recently endeavored to do, with some success — that these modifications come from the author himself.[2] But, setting aside these various readings or interpolations, it is manifest that St. Cyprian does not regard the see of Rome as an ordinary see. It is Peter's see, and the bishops of Rome are Peter's successors.[3] Now the Church was founded first on Peter and on Peter alone;[4] and this fact, as we have seen, has a symbolical meaning: it marks the unity which Jesus Christ intended to exist in His Church, and of which the Church of Rome thus becomes the centre and starting-point. This is why that Church is the chief Church, whence arose the unity of the Episcopate: "ad Petri cathedram atque ad ecclesiam principalem unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est;"[1] the Church communion with which establishes one in the unity and charity of the Catholic Church: "communicationem tuam, id est, catholicae ecclesiae unitatem pariter et caritatem."[2]

---

[1] *Ep.* LXXI, 3; *Sententiae episcoporum*, Proemium.

[2] Cf. J. Chapman, *Les interpolations dans le traité de saint Cyprien sur l'unité de l'Eglise*, in the *Revue bénédictine*, vol. XIX, XX, 1902, 1903. E. W. Watson, *The interpolations in St. Cyprian's De unitate ecclesiae*, in the *Journal of Theol. Studies*, vol. V, 1904. P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 440–447.

[3] *Ep.* LV, 9.

[4] *De unit.*, 4; *Epp.* XLIII, 5; LIX, 7; LXVI, 7; LXXI, 3; LXXIII, 7: cf. *Firmilian's Letter*, LXXV, 16.

The centre of the unity is at Rome; the communion with that centre constitutes and shows the unity of the Church. But Cyprian did not go further, or, if he did go further, he did not draw, in the Baptismal controversy, the consequences of his principles. In practice, he had acknowledged Stephen's right to intervene in the affairs of Gaul, and, after deposing the Bishop of Arles, Marcianus, to have another one chosen in his stead;[3] in theory, he refuses to the bishop of Rome any higher power that may be needed to maintain the unity of which he is the centre, the many threads of which are, as it were, all gathered in his hand. Cyprian emphasizes what he has said, viz., that, although the Church is founded on Peter, yet all the Apostles received the same power and dignity as he did: "Hoc erant utique et ceteri apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio praediti et honoris et potestatis."[4] Hence, he concludes, Peter — contrarily to Stephen — did not ascribe the primacy to himself ("ut diceret se primatum tenere,") nor did he require obedience from the newcomers, from St. Paul in particular.[5] There is, in the Church, no "episcopus episcoporum," who has the right tyrannically to impose his will on his colleagues. Each bishop rules his own diocese in all independence and is amenable to God alone: he can no more be judged by his equals than judge them; all must wait for the judgment of Jesus Christ. This is why, St. Cyprian concludes, we are not allowed, in the Baptismal controversy, to break up fellowship with those that do not share our views: "Neque enim quisquam nostrum episcopum se episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit, quando habeat omnis episcopus pro licentia libertatis et potestatis suae arbitrium proprium, tamque iudicari ab alio non possit quam nec ipse possit alterum iudicare, sed expectemus universi iudicium Domini nostri Iesu Christi." [1]

---

[1] *Ep.* LIX, 14.

[2] *Ep.* XLVIII, 3.

[3] *Ep.* LXVIII.

[4] *De unit.*, 4.

[5] *Ep.* LXXI, 3.

These statements, which savor of Episcopalianism, cause wonder, as coming from a man so desirous of unity, who realized so well the conditions of an effective government. They may be explained, not only by the enthusiasm of polemics, but also by the influence of Tertullian, whom St. Cyprian had much studied, and by the fact that our author paid far more attention to the unity of each particular Church, of which the bishop is the centre, than to the unity of the universal Church. Moreover his deeds did not perfectly square with his theory, and it has been justly remarked that, by centring in his hands, as he did, the government of the Church of Africa, and preparing for Carthage the title of primatial see, he had given to his declarations in behalf of Rome as the centre of catholic unity, a practical comment which was not lost, and which contributed to group more and more effectively the Christian world around St. Peter's successor.

In St. Cyprian's theory, the Church is the depositary of the power of Jesus Christ and the bestower of His graces. The Sacraments are therefore *her* Sacraments, and she alone can confer them validly: we shall examine later on this subject, and here consider merely the holy Doctor's teaching on each Sacrament in particular.

Baptism is a second birth, the principle of salvation and faith: [2] it remits sins, sanctifies man and makes him God's temple.[1] It must be imparted to children, and unlike circumcision, may be administered before the eighth day.[2] By this Baptism, children receive grace, just as well as adults, the more so that having not sinned and being afflicted through their birth from Adam only with the contagion of the former death, they obtain the forgiveness, not of their own sins, but of borrowed sins.[3] However, the Baptism of water may be replaced by martyrdom which also confers grace, nay a more abundant and excellent grace: "in gratia maius, in potestate sublimius." [4]

---

[1] *Sententiae episcoporum*, proemium; *Epp.* LXXII, 3; LXXIII, 26.

[2] *Ad Donatum*, 4; *De dominica oratione*, 23; *Ep.* LXXIII, 12.

To Baptism anointing (*chrismatio*) is added, that the neophyte may have in him the grace of Christ.[5] This ceremony is the same as the one of which St. Cyprian speaks in his LXXIIIrd letter, 9, and which includes a prayer, the laying on of the hand and the *signaculum dominicum:* all this, to impart the Holy Ghost. It may be also the same rite as the one used for the reconciliation of heretics, in which we find the laying on of the hand and the anointing: "Non est necesse ei venienti manum imponi ut spiritum sanctum consequatur et signetur." [6]

Those who have been baptized receive, immediately after their Baptism, the Eucharist.[7] To prepare the latter, wine mixed with water is needed.[8] The Eucharist is "the holy body of the Lord," which the *lapsi* profane, His body and blood.[1] It is a sacrifice. St. Cyprian is one of the Fathers that insisted most on this character, and his testimony deserves a special notice. The Eucharistic sacrifice, he says, was first offered by Jesus Christ, the priest according to the order of Melchizedek and in imitation of his sacrifice: now, it is offered, as a true and complete sacrifice, by men as priests, who act "vice Christi," and do again what the Saviour did (sacrificium verum et plenum, secundum quod ipsum Christum videat obtulisse).[2] Besides, that sacrifice is the same as the one on the Cross, and while we celebrate it, we present to God the Redeemer's passion: "passio est enim Domini sacrificium quod offerimus." [3] It is offered up for penitent sinners and in their name,[4] as well as for the dead.[5]

---

[1] *Ep.* LXXIII, 12.

[2] *Ep.* LXIV, 2.

[3] "Quanto magis prohiberi non debet infans, qui recens natus nihil peccavit, nisi quod secundum Adam carnaliter natus contagium mortis antiquae prima nativitate contraxit, qui ad remissam peccatorum accipiendam hoc ipso facilius accedit quod illi remittuntur non propria sed aliena peccata" (*Ep.* LXIV, 5).

[4] *Ad Fortunatum*, praef., 4; *Ep.* LXXIII, 22.

[5] *Ep.* LXX, 2.

[6] *Ep.* LXXIII, 6.

[7] *Ep.* LXX, 2.

[8] *Ep.* LXIII, 2, 9.

St. Cyprian's ideas on penance are known to us: however, we may add what he says of the necessity of confessing to the bishop one's sins, nay one's interior and secret sins, and of receiving his pardon, after having made satisfaction: in the first text, he refers to some Christians who had thought of apostatizing, though actually they had not done so: "Qui quamvis nullo sacrificii aut libelli facinore constricti, quoniam tamen de hoc vel cogitaverunt, hoc ipsum apud sacerdotes Dei dolenter et simpliciter confitentes exomologesim conscientiae faciant, animi sui pondus exponant," etc.[6] "Confiteantur singuli, quaeso vos, fratres, delictum suum, dum admitti confessio eius potest, dum satisfactio et remissio [facta] per sacerdotes apud Dominum grata est." [7] We have seen that in other passages, the Bishop of Carthage grants that in danger of death, an ordinary priest, nay in his absence a deacon, may administer the exomologesis, and lay the hand on a penitent "in paenitentiam." [1]

---

[1] *Ep.* XV, 1; LXIII, 4; *De lapsis*, 25.
[2] *Ep.* LXIII, 4, 14.
[3] *Ep.* LXIII, 17; cf. 5, 9.
[4] *Ep.* XVI, 2; XVII, 2.
[5] *Ep.* I, 2.
[6] *De lapsis*, 28.
[7] *De lapsis*, 29.

St. Cyprian mentions often Order and the ordinations [2] which the bishop performed together with his *presbyterium*,[3] even the consecration of bishops, the rite of which is the imposition of hands.[4] As to marriage, he reproduces St. Paul's teaching in regard to its indissolubility, and prohibition to unite with heathens.[5]

As the questions of government, so also those pertaining to moral conduct naturally drew his attention, and to them he devoted several writings. We may point out a few features of his views. Our author is conscious of a corruption of human nature because of Adam's fault, and as we have seen, he seems to lay borrowed sins to the charge of the infant just born.[6] Yet he does not state his thought with precision, and even declares elsewhere that we cannot become guilty for somebody else: "Nec posse alium pro altero reum fieri." [7] — Faith is free (credendi vel non credendi libertatem in arbitrio positam); [8] but it is effective in the measure in which we possess it.[9] — Christian Ethics include precepts and counsels.[10] By practising both, we merit, in the true and proper meaning of the term: God becomes our debtor and He will pay His debt: "Deum computat debitorem;" "Nusquam Dominus meritis nostris ad praemium deerit." [11] On the contrary, when we neglect our duties, we become God's debtors, although we can offer Him satisfaction by good works: "operibus iustis Deo satisfieri." [1] The last doctrinal statements naturally recall Tertullian's ideas and phraseology.

---

[1] *Ep.* XVIII, 1.

[2] *Ep.* I, 1; XXXVIII, 2; LXVI, 1; LXVII, 6.

[3] *Ep.* XXXVIII, 2.

[4] *Ep.* LXVII, 5.

[5] *Testimonia*, III, 62, 90; *De lapsis*, 6.

[6] *Ep.* LXIV, 5; *Ad Donatum*, 3; *De opere et eleemos.*, 1.

[7] *Ep.* LV, 27.

[8] *Testimonia*, III, 52.

[9] *Testimonia*, III, 42.

[10] *De habitu virginum*, 23; cf. 3, 20, 22.

[11] *De opere et eleem.*, 26; cf. 9, 17, 23.

In regard to St. Cyprian's eschatology, it is quite simple. He believes in the near end of the world and in the coming of Antichrist.[2] In the LVth letter, 20, he seems to allude to a purifying fire (purgari diu igne); on the other hand, however, he regards as eternal the torments of Hell, "aeterna gehennae supplicia." [3]

We have already mentioned some of the anonymous treatises ascribed to St. Cyprian and placed after his works (edit. HARTEL, vol. III). Among the others, the *Liber de rebaptismate* will have later on a special claim on our attention. The writing *Ad Novatianum* merely reproduces against Novatian the teaching of the Bishop of Carthage on penance. The short discourse *De aleatoribus*, against gamesters, probably the work of some African bishop of the third century,[4] contains, from a dogmatic standpoint, besides the affirmation of the bishop's rights (1–4), merely a few details concerning the reception of the Eucharist (5). As to the treatise *De montibus Sina et Sion*, which follows and may be a translation from the Greek, it betrays in its author a bold allegorist, some of whose interpretations are simply amazing (4). Moreover Harnack [5] has expressed the opinion that Adoptianism is taught in the work. Jesus would be the man, while Christ would be the eternal Son or the Holy Ghost in the man: "Caro dominica a Deo patre Iesu vocita est: Spiritus sanctus qui de caelo descendit Christus, id est unctus Dei vivi Deo vocitus est. Spiritus carni mixtus Iesus Christus" (4; cf. 13: "Spiritus sanctus Dei filius.") However, this explanation has been called in question,[1] and a similar expression is found in St. Cyprian.[2]

---

[1] *De opere et eleem.*, 5, 4; *Epp.* XXXV; LV, 11; LIX, 13; LXIV, 1; *De lapsis*, 17, 34.

[2] *De mortalitate*, 25; *De unit.*, 16; *Ad Demetrianum*, 3–5; *Ad Fortunatum*, praef., 1; *Epp.* LIX, 18; LXI, 4; LXIII, 18; LXVII, 7.

[3] *Ep.* LIX, 18.

[4] Cf. MONCEAUX, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrét.*, II, p. 112–115.

[5] *Lehrb. der D G.*, I, 676, note; *History of Dogma*, vol. III, p. 33.

§ 2. — The Baptismal Controversy.[3]

We saw above with what careful solicitude St. Cyprian reserved to the Church the privilege of bestowing the grace of Jesus Christ. This idea, pushed to the extreme, was to lead him to regrettable errors in judging the value of the Baptism given by heretics.

It is important to notice the practical character of the rise of the question. Until Montanism, no heresy — except Marcionitism — had formed an independent Church. All these sects hid themselves in the widespread Church, and their followers received from her Baptism and Christian initiation. If later on they recanted their errors and came back to the true faith, they were reconciled by the laying on of the hands *in paenitentiam*, or even by the anointing with oil, the *consignatio*, viz., according to several authors, by Confirmation; as to their Baptism, it was not renewed, since they had received it from the true Church.

But after the heresies of Marcion, Montanus and others had organized separate communities, it happened that the Catholic Church saw now and then some applying to enter her bosom, who had been baptized in those sects, whether they were born therein or had come thereto directly from Heathenism.

---

[1] SEEBERG, *Lehrb. der D G.*, p. 124, note 2.

[2] *Quod idola non sint dii*, 11.

[3] Sources: The letters of St. Cyprian and of Firmilian, edit. HARTEL. The *Liber de rebaptismate*, same edit., vol. III. — Works: Those about St. Cyprian, and besides, H. GRISAR, *Cyprians "Oppositionskonzil" gegen Papst Stephan*, in the *Zeitschr. f. Kath. Theol.*, V, 1881. J. ERNST, *Zur Auffassung Cyprians von der Ketzertaufe*, *ibid.*, XVII, 1893. P. BATIFFOL, *op. cit.* L. SALTET, *Les Réordinations*, Paris, 1907, pp. 15 and foll.

How should they be treated? Was this Baptism to be regarded as sufficient and were they to receive merely the imposition of hands and the *consignatio;* or was their Baptism to be considered as void, and their Christian initiation, be completely renewed?

It was in this practical form — let it be observed — that the value of the Baptism of heretics came to be discussed. What was to be *done?* True, this question implied a theoretical question more general: is the faith of the minister (or of the subject) needed for the validity and efficacy of the Sacrament? However, this latter point of view always remained in the background: this is why St. Cyprian and his followers may have seen — as it seems they actually did — in the whole controversy nothing but a disciplinary question which did not concern the integrity of faith nor deserve that the unity of the Church should be sacrificed on its account either by schism or by excommunication.

Anyhow, two customs were received in the Church during the third century, as to the topic now before us. The first, that of Rome, followed also at Cæsarea of Palestine and probably at Alexandria, was not to renew the Baptism of heretics, but merely to impart to them the laying on of the hands and the *consignatio;*[1] the second, that of Carthage and of Africa, followed at Antioch and at Cæsarea of Cappadocia, in Cilicia, Galatia and neighboring provinces, was to regard that Baptism as null, and to renew it. We are informed, in regard to Rome by the *Philosophoumena* (IX, 12, p. 446),[2] and by the affirmations of Pope Stephen always recalling the tradition of his Church; in regard to Cæsarea of Palestine, by

---

[1] St. Cyprian, *Ep.* LXXIII, 6.

[2] The author tells us that under Callistus, for the first time, some were bold enough to rebaptize.

Eusebius (*Eccles. Hist.*, VII, chap. 2 and 3), who simply qualifies the usage as ancient which prevailed later on; in regard to Alexandria, by her Bishop, Dionysius, who, although exhibiting more moderation than the Pope, still agrees with him after all.[1] On the other hand, Tertullian had already considered as void the Baptism of heretics,[2] and St. Cyprian appeals in behalf of the same views to the decisions of a Council held about the year 198,[3] under one of his predecessors, Agrippinus.[4] For Antioch and Syria, we have the testimony of the *Apostolical Constitutions* (VI, 15; cf. *Apostolical Canons*, 45, 46), which, although they appeared later on, yet do not seem to have been tampered with on this point. Finally Firmilian of Cæsarea (in Cappadocia)[5] has not failed to tell us what was the practice of his Church and that of the neighboring provinces. The Councils of Iconium and Synnada in Phrygia, held about the years 230–235 and referred to by Dionysius of Alexandria,[6] had both declared themselves against the Baptism conferred by heretics.

Such was the situation when the controversy began. In Africa, notwithstanding the custom generally received, scruples became manifest, almost everywhere. Three times during the year 255, St. Cyprian had to answer consultations on that subject.[1] He did it always by affirming that heretics and schismatics had no power to give Baptism: "Dicimus omnes omnino haereticos et schismaticos nihil habere potestatis ac iuris." [2] However, he was conscious that the opposition came from Rome and that the Roman custom was the chief objection which worked on the minds of Christians. To do away with the resistance, he determined to elicit a decisive explanation. In May 256, he gathered at Carthage a council of 71 Bishops, had them approve his conclusions and wrote to the Pope his LXXIInd letter, in which he maintained (3) the right of each bishop to solve this question for once and all, according to his liking. He sent to Rome at the same time his LXXth and his LXXIst letter, this last one to Quintus.

---

[1] St. Jerome (*De viris illustr.*, 69) says explicitly that St. Dionysius of Alexandria was of St. Cyprian's mind. But it is difficult to reconcile this statement with the fragments of Dionysius preserved by Eusebius, with the part of peacemaker he strove to play in this affair, and his own way of acting. St. Basil, on the contrary, affirms that St. Dionysius acknowledged the Baptism of the Montanists: at which he wonders (*Epist.* CLXXXVIII, can. 1, *P. G.*, XXXII, col. 664, 668). There could be no doubt on the doctrinal agreement of Dionysius and Stephen, were the fragments (a Syriac translation) ascribed to Dionysius and published by C. L. Feltoe (*The Letters and other Remains of Dionysius of Alexandria*, pp. 48, 49) authentic; but that authenticity is quite doubtful.

[2] *De baptismo*, 15; cf. *De pudicitia*, 19.

[3] This is the date adopted by H. Leclercq, *L'Afrique chrêtienne*, II, p. 344; cf. I, p. 32; and by P. Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrêtienne*, II, pp. 19, 20.

[4] St. Cyprian, *Epp.* LXXI, 4; LXXIII, 3.

[5] *Ep.* LXXV, 7, 19.

[6] Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist.*, VII, 7, 5.

The Pope was then Stephen (May 12, 254– Aug. 2, 257). A certain coldness, brought on by previous discussions, already existed between him and St. Cyprian; and it could hardly be decreased by the tone of Cyprian's letter and especially by the tenor of his LXXIst letter which was simply offensive for the Pope.[3] No wonder therefore that, according to the account left by Firmilian of Cæsarea, Stephen received Cyprian's messengers quite ungraciously and very harshly treated the Bishop of Carthage.[1] Although he did not actually break off communion, at least he threatened to do so, with the Churches of Africa and those which followed the same practice, in case they would not give it up.[2] Let it be observed, however, that of his answer to St. Cyprian we have only the chief phrase recorded by St. Cyprian himself: "Si qui ergo a quacumque haeresi veniant ad vos, nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est, ut manus illis imponatur in paenitentiam, cum ipsi haeretici proprie alterutrum ad se venientes non baptizent, sed communicent tantum."[3]

---

[1] *Epp.* LXIX, LXX, LXXI.

[2] *Ep.* LXIX, 1.

[3] Some authors think and say that, although St. Cyprian made a mistake on the subject of the dispute, yet, as far as proceedings go, he played the better part. Perhaps they might be less peremptory in their opinion, if they would observe that, as we do not possess the Pope's answer, we know what was his way of acting, after all, only through his adversaries, St. Cyprian and Firmilian. Now, as we will see later on, the latter displays in his LXXVth letter an uncommon violence; as to the former, the fact of sending to Stephen his letter to Quintus was an egregious blunder, if not an impertinent boldness. In this letter (3), St. Cyprian observes that St. Peter did not claim "insolently nor arrogantly" for himself the primacy: a manifest allusion to the claims of the Pope.

No doubt Stephen had taken a view of this matter quite different from that of the Bishop of Carthage; and what was probably for the latter a merely disciplinary question was looked upon by the Pope as a question that concerned the integrity of faith itself. Later on, we shall examine the arguments brought forward by both parties. At any rate, although he was taken by surprise, St. Cyprian was not put out of countenance and withstood his adversary. Some time after receiving the Pope's answer, in the summer of the year 256, he sent a copy of it to Bishop Pompeius, which he accompanied with an impassioned criticism. In it he charged Stephen with error: "eius errorem denotabis" (1), pointed out the "a quacumque haeresi," and the "cum ipsi haeretici, etc.," of his answer (3), and added that bishops ought not only to teach, but also to learn and acquire knowledge (10). Then, in September 256, he convoked a Council of 84 Bishops from Africa, Numidia and Mauritania, who unanimously approved his decisions and conduct;[4] finally he sought for allies in the East. Prompted by him, Firmilian, Bishop of Cæsarea of

---

[1] *Firmilian's Letter*, LXXV, 25.

[2] *Firmilian's Letter*, LXXV, 25; *Sententiae episcoporum*, proemium; Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist.*, VII, 5, 4.

[3] *Ep.* LXXIV, 1.

[4] *Sententiae episcoporum* (Hartel, I, pp. 435, foll.).

Cappadocia, a man commendable for his virtue and learning, wrote to tell him that he himself, as well as his colleagues of Phrygia, Galatia, Cilicia and the neighboring provinces, agreed with the Churches of Africa in rejecting the Baptism of heretics. This letter (the LXXVth) is extremely harsh for the Pope, whom it calls a schismatic and a heretic in the highest degree: "Tu haereticis omnibus peior es" (23). "Ille est vere schismaticus qui se a communione ecclesiasticae unitatis apostatam fecerit. Dum enim putas omnes a te abstineri posse, solum te ab omnibus abstinuisti" (24).

So, neither Cyprian nor Firmilian accepted the Pope's decision; although unwilling to separate from Rome, the Churches of Africa and of Cappadocia stood up in resistance against her. It is hard to say what might have happened, had Stephen survived. But he died on August 2, 257. While maintaining the custom of his Church, his successor Xystus II (August 30, 257– August 6, 258) did not deem it wise to urge, as much as Stephen, its acceptation by the dissenting Bishops: this was also the mind of his advisers, as well as that of Dionysius of Alexandria. Although agreeing on the whole, it seems, with Rome, the latter did not think that the question was such as to justify them to pass by the view of important Councils and break off with half of the Church. He had already written in this sense to Pope Stephen;[1] he wrote also to Xystus II,[2] and to two Roman priests, Dionysius and Philemon,[3] the first of whom, was destined soon to ascend St. Peter's chair. There the matter stood for the time being.

It is interesting to study the reasons brought forward by both parties in this dispute. Those of the rebaptizers are easy to find in the letters of St. Cyprian and of Firmilian; those likewise of the Roman party are known to us, at least sufficiently, both by the refutation St. Cyprian opposes to them, and by an anonymous treatise, the *Liber de rebaptismate*, probably written about the year 256 by an African Bishop, who shared the Pope's views.[1] Yet, we cannot but regret that Stephen's reply is lost; it would perhaps lighten up points that are obscure.

---

[1] Euseb., *Eccles. Hist.*, VII, 4; 5, 1, 2.

[2] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, VII, 5, 3–6; 9.

[3] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, VII, 5, 6; 7.

In the reasoning of St. Cyprian and of Firmilian, the confusion between the *validity* of Baptism and its *efficacy* is complete. They do not imagine that a Baptism that does not directly remit sins can be taken into account at all.

Now that the Baptism given by heretics and schismatics is incapable of remitting sins, is a conclusion of this fundamental principle often repeated: viz., that the true Church alone can effect that remission; that in her alone, grace and the means to impart or to receive it are to be found; that she is the ark outside of which there is no salvation, the sealed spring from which outsiders cannot draw; that heretics and schismatics, being outside the Church, cannot therefore communicate the grace of Baptism nor cleanse souls.[2] Then, they added, Baptism is the bringing forth of the children of God; now heresy is not the spouse of Jesus Christ, hence it cannot beget children to Him.[3] Besides, the opponents grant that heretics cannot give the Holy Spirit, since they receive into the Church, precisely through the rite that confers the Holy Spirit, those of the dissenters who come back to the fold: why should heretics be incapable of that communication, if their Baptism remits sins? For, after all, the Holy Spirit is the author of the remission of sins in Baptism. The Church, the Holy Ghost, true Baptism, are three terms that are closely connected and necessarily go hand in hand.[4] — Again, another series of ideas — still more dangerous —: how can a minister of the Sacrament, who personally possesses neither the true faith nor divine grace, nor the Holy Spirit, how can he impart these to others? How can he, who is God's enemy, be His coöperator? "Quomodo autem mundare et sanctificare aquam potest qui ipse immundus est? . . . aut quomodo baptizans dare alteri remissionem peccatorum potest qui ipse sua peccata deponere extra ecclesiam non potest?"[1] "Haereticum hominem sicut ordinare non licet, nec manum imponere, ita nec baptizare, nec quicquam sancte et spiritaliter gerere, quando alienus sit a spiritali et deifica sanctitate."[2] Likewise too, attention ought to be paid to the faith of the baptized neophyte, who cannot receive the grace given in the Church, unless he believes what the Church believes.[3] In fine, while the opponents invoke the practice of Rome, the Africans may invoke their own practice, long since sanctioned by the Council held under Agrippinus.[4]

---

[1] Cf. P. Monceaux, *Hist. litt. de l'Afrique Chrét.*, II, pp. 91–97.

[2] *Epp.* LXIX, 2, 3; LXXIII, 7, 10–12; LXXIV, 11; LXXV, 11, 16.

[3] *Ep.* LXXIV, 6; LXXV, 14.

[4] *Epp.* LXIX, 10, 11; LXX, 3; LXXIII, 6; LXXIV, 4, 5; LXXV, 8, 12.

As a matter of fact, the custom, the "consuetudo" was one of the chief arguments brought forward by the Pope's party: "Nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est, ut manus illis imponatur in paenitentiam."[5] This is the one enlarged upon in the whole *Liber de rebaptismate*: "Existimo nos non infirmam rationem reddidisse consuetudinis causam . . . quanquam haec consuetudo, etiam sola, deberet apud homines timorem Domini habentes and humiles praecipuum locum obtinere" (19). This is why St. Cyprian sometimes denies the proving force of custom in general (non est autem de consuetudine praescribendum, sed ratione vincendum),[1] sometimes too calls in question the divine and apostolic origin of the particular custom brought against him. [2]

---

[1] *Epp.* LXX, 1; LXIX, 8; LXXI, 1.

[2] *Ep.* LXXV, 7, 9–11.

[3] *Ep.* LXXIII, 4, 17, 18.

[4] *Epp.* LXXI, 4; LXXIII, 3.

[5] *Ep.* LXXIV, 1. Some have understood these words in the sense that nothing should be renewed, but what tradition commands should be renewed, viz., the laying on of the hand: "nihil innovetur nisi," etc. However, this is not the meaning attached by the contemporaries to the word *innovetur* (St. Cyprian, *Ep.* LXXIV, 2; cf. *Ep.* LXX, 5; *De rebaptismate*, 1). The Pope lays down a general principle: the custom is to be maintained, and no innovation, made. Now, this custom enjoins only the imposition of the hand.

This was not the only argument to which the Roman party appealed. The Bishop of Carthage reproached the Pope for alleging the example of those heretics who did not rebaptize their converts:[3] but his own attention was drawn to the fact that by readministering Baptism, he was following on the footsteps of the Novatianists who also gave again Baptism to their recruits.[4] It was said besides that the faith of the baptized, not of the person who baptizes, has to be taken into account;[5] that St. Peter and St. John did not rebaptize the Samaritans;[6] that to require a new Baptism would be to throw an obstacle in the way of the conversion of heretics.[7] The chief argument insisted on, however, was the power of the divine names invoked in the Baptismal formula, a power which is exercised independently of the minister's faith and dignity.[8] This last argument is set forth more especially in the *Liber de rebaptismate.* The author of that work — which is confused and lacks proper order — begins to get some light on the distinction between the *validity* and the *efficacy* of the Baptismal rite. To receive the whole efficacy of Baptism, he remarks, we must be born of water and of the Spirit (2). To be born again of the Spirit is, after all, what is most important, since the ceremony of immersion can be otherwise compensated for, as is the case with martyrdom (11, 14, 15). Anyhow, these two things can be separated, and one can go without the other (3, 4). That is what takes place in the Baptism of heretics. In the latter, the immersion is performed in the name of Jesus. The power of that invocation, even on the lips of a heretic, is such that it begins the work of regeneration, and makes another performance of the rite unnecessary (6, 7, 10, 12, 15). However, it does not suffice to perfect that regeneration. If the neophyte dies before coming back to the true faith, his Baptism does not avail him anything (6, 7, 10), or rather does nothing but make his condemnation worse; while, if he comes to the true fold, it is enough to complete, by the conferring of the Holy Ghost, the first ceremony, that it may have its full effect (10; cf. 12, 15).

---

[1] *Epp.* LXXI, 3; LXXIII, 13, 23; LXXIV, 9; LXXV, 19.
[2] *Epp.* LXXIII, 13; LXXIV, 2, 3.
[3] *Ep.* LXXIV, 3.
[4] *Ep.* LXXIII, 2.
[5] *Ep.* LXXIII, 4.
[6] *Ep.* LXXIII, 9.
[7] *Ep.* LXXIII, 24.
[8] *Ep.* LXXIII, 4; LXXV, 9.

Although, as we have said, the question was not solved solemnly in the third century, yet peace was made between the successor of Stephen, Xystus II, and St. Cyprian,[1] and between the successor of Xystus II, Dionysius, and the Church of Cæsarea in Cappadocia.[2] Besides, Africa soon adopted the Roman custom. The Council of Arles in the year 314, which was attended by many African Bishops, decreed in its 8th canon: "De Afris quod propria lege sua utuntur ut rebaptizent, placuit ut, si ad Ecclesiam aliquis de haeresi venerit, interrogent eum symbolum; et si perviderint eum in Patre et Filio et Spiritu sancto esse baptizatum, manus ei tantum imponatur ut accipiat Spiritum sanctum. Quod si interrogatus non responderit hanc Trinitatem, baptizetur." At the time of St. Augustine, the orthodox did not meet with any difficulty on that subject.

In the East, the hesitancy lasted longer. At the end of the fourth century, St. Basil witnesses that at Iconium the Roman decisions had been adopted; though, as to himself, in Cæsarea, he followed a contrary practice, being ready at the same time to come to a compromise for the sake of peace, and to acknowledge as valid the Baptism of those who are merely schismatic.[1] The Council of Nicæa in Bithynia (325) admitted the ordinations of the Novatianists (can. 8), while it commanded to rebaptize the followers of Paul of Samosata (can. 19). However, St. Athanasius affirms[2] that the latter baptized in the name of the Trinity, although they did not understand, he says, by the Father and the Son, what the Church understands: they held heretical views, and this was a sufficient reason for rejecting their Baptism. For the same motive, he himself rejects the Baptism of the Arians, which he declares to be void and useless, κενὸν καὶ ἀλυσιτελές.[3]

---

[1] PONTIUS, *Cypriani vita*, 14 (HARTEL, *S. Cypriani opera*, III, p. cv); cf. *Ep.* LXXX, 1.

[2] ST. BASIL, *Epist.* LXX, *P. G.*, XXXII, 436.

As to Antioch and Syria, the *Apostolical Constitutions*, quoted above, prove that, as late as the fourth century, the Baptism of heretics was still regarded there as null. In his *Procatechesis*, 7, St. Cyril of Jerusalem testifies to the same discipline.

---

[1] *Epist.* CXCIX, can. 47; *Epist.* CLXXXVIII, can. 1.

[2] *Contra Arianos*, II, 43.

[3] *Contra Arianos*, II, 42. From this it seems that the Baptism of heretics who erred on the Trinitarian doctrine was not acknowledged. The alteration of their faith on this point took away its efficacy from the formula they used and improperly understood.

CHAPTER XII

THEOLOGY IN THE EAST FROM ORIGEN UNTIL THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA

§ 1.— The Successors and Disciples of Origen. St. Dionysius of Alexandria.[1]

It is no easy task to follow the general development of Theology in the East from the age after Origen till the Council of Nicæa. Whatever may be the cause of the gaps we find in the literary history of that epoch, the writings that have come down to us are relatively few and most of them in a mutilated state. Many are known to us only through the quotations of subsequent authors and nothing but incomplete information can be gathered from these far too brief quotations.

We do not know if Heraclas, Origen's successor or colleague at the head of the School, composed any works: at any rate, nothing has remained. On becoming Bishop of Alexandria, about the year 232, he made over to Dionysius the management of the catechetical school. Dionysius, surnamed the Great, is the best known and the most illustrious of Origen's successors in that function: he too ascended, about the year 248, the patriarchal see.

---

[1] The edition quoted is that of *P. G.*, X; the fragments of the correspondence of the two Dionysii are quoted according to the edition of St. Athanasius in *P. G.*, XXV, XXVI. However, the most useful edition of all these documents is that of C. L. Feltoe, *The Letters and other Remains of Dionysius of Alexandria*, Cambridge, 1904.—Works: Dittrich, *Dionysius der Grosse von Alexandrien*, Friburg in Brisgau, 1867. P. Morize, *Denys d'Alexandrie, Etude d'histoire religieuse*, Paris, 1881. H. Hagemann, *Die römische Kirche und ihr Einfluss auf Disziplin und Dogma in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, Friburg in Brisgau, 1864. Th. Foerster, *De doctrina et sententiis Dionysii Magni episc. Alexandrini*, Berlin, 1865.

He was a man of great culture, whose literary activity was no doubt intense, although no production of his, except one or two, has reached us in its entirety. His philosophical tastes are shown clearly by some fragments of his *Apology* and of a work Περὶ φύσεως, fragments put by Eusebius in his *Praeparatio Evangelica* (VII, 19; XIV, 23–27). The first fragment confutes the eternity of matter; the others impugn the atomism of Epicurus and contain an interesting development of the teleological argument in behalf of God's existence and providence.[1] Moreover, we know that Dionysius rejected emphatically Millenarianism and denied to St. John the authorship of the Apocalypse;[2] that he interfered between the Pope and the dissenters in the Baptismal controversy,[3] and that he showed himself rather easy for reconciling the *lapsi*, especially when they had received the peace from the confessors of the faith.[4] An important testimony on the Eucharist as "a sacred food," "the body and blood of Jesus Christ" is found in one of his letters to Xystus II, quoted by Eusebius.[5] As regards his Christology, we may merely notice the affirmation of two wills in Jesus Christ, God and man: one, which is the same as that of the Father, the other which can bend towards a different object, although with submission to the former.[6]

The most important part of his Theology is his Trinitarian teaching. On this point we are more extensively informed, because of an incident the bearing of which is momentous for the history of Dogma, and which took place between the years 259–261.

---

[1] *P. G.*, X, 1269, foll.; 1249, foll.

[2] EUSEB., *Eccl. Hist.*, VII, 24, 25. Cf. above, chapter IV, § 8.

[3] EUSEB., *Eccl. Hist.*, VII, 2; 4; 5; 7; 9. Cf. the preceding chapter.

[4] EUSEB., *Eccl. Hist.*, VI, 42, 5, 6; VI, 44; cf. *P. G.*, X, 1305, foll.

[5] *Eccl. Hist.*, VII, 9, 4.

[6] *P. G.*, X, 1597, 1599; cf. HARNACK, *Gesch. der altchristl. Litter.*, *Die Ueberlief.*, p. 421.

After its condemnation by Callistus, Sabellianism had been unable really to hold its ground in the West. In the East, it continued to live for several years. In the year 244, Origen had to bring back to the true doctrine Beryllus, Bishop of Bostra in Arabia.[1] Whether the latter was precisely a Modalist or an Adoptianist, is rather difficult to infer from the short statements of Eusebius. He boldly taught, the historian writes, that the Saviour did not exist in a proper being before the Incarnation, and that He had not a divinity of His own, but only the Father's divinity dwelling in Him.[2] Anyhow, under the episcopate of Heraclas, and next under that of Dionysius, — in virtue of what circumstances, is hard to say — Sabellianism spread extensively in Egypt, and especially in the Pentapolis.[3] Although preached under the name of Sabellius, the error was not exactly, at least on the surface, Patripassianism as it had been taught in Rome by Sabellius. It had gradually developed into the following form, under which the authors of the fourth century describe it, and which may be fitly called Modalism.[4]

God, a simple and indivisible monad, is one person: He is called *υἱοπάτωρ*, Father-Son; in His office of creator of the world, He takes the name of Word. The Word then is God, the *υἱοπάτωρ* manifesting Himself through the creation. Of course, this manifestation lasts as long as the world itself, and causes this aspect of Word to be permanent in God.

---

[1] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, VI, 33.

[2] *Τὸν σωτῆρα καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν λέγειν τολμῶν μὴ προϋφεστάναι κατ' ἰδίαν οὐσίας περιγραφὴν πρὸ τῆς εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἐπιδηίηας, μηδὲ μὴν θεότητα ἰδίαν ἔχειν, ἀλλ' ἐμπολιτευωμένην αὐτῷ μόνην τὴν πατρικήν* (Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, VI, 33, 1).

[3] St. Athanasius, *De sententia Dionysii*, 5.

[4] The chief sources are: St. Athanasius, *Expositio fidei*, 2; *Oratio contra Arianos*, III, 36; IV, 2, 3, 9, 13, 15, 17; *De synodis*, 16; *De decretis nicaenae synodi*. St. Hilary. *De Trinitate*, IV, 12. St. Epiphanius, *Haer.* LXII.

Now, to the world thus created the monad reveals itself, in the Old Covenant, as lawgiver: this is the Father; in the New Covenant, as Redeemer through the Incarnation: we then have the Son; and as sanctifier of souls: this is the Holy Ghost. These three successive states of the monad do not constitute distinct persons: they are only three aspects, three powers, three modalities, and as three names of the same being (*ὡς εἶναι ἐν μίᾳ ὑποστάσει τρεῖς ὀνομασίας*). The Sabellians, St. Epiphanius continues, would bring here to explain their meaning, a comparison from the sun: the Son of God is as its light, the Holy Spirit, its heat, the Father, its circular form (*τὸν δὲ πατέρα αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸ εἶδος πάσης τῆς ὑποστάσεως*).[1]

Moreover, — and this is a point we should observe — each one of these three states is temporary and transitory. The *υἱοπάτωρ* ceases being Father as soon as He puts on our flesh and becomes Son; He ceases being Son, as soon as He appears as Holy Spirit.[2] What is Son in Jesus Christ, is the human nature united with God: once the union broken, the Sonship comes to an end. All these transformations were accounted for by the fact that the monad was subject to a twofold motion of expansion and of withdrawal, *πλατυσμός*, *συστολη*, which dilated or repressed its action and was called the divine *διάλεξις*.

Thus, this form of Sabellianism differed from the Patripassianism of old: (1) by the transitory character of the various *πρόσωπα*: the Father could not be said any more to have suffered; (2) by the introduction into the system, of the person of the Holy Spirit, which formerly was not mentioned; (3)

---

[1] St. Epiphanius, *Haer.* LXII, 1.

[2] St. Epiphanius, *Haer.* LXII, 3. On the contrary St. Athanasius (*Oratio contra Arianos*, IV, 25) supposes that it is the Father, who, although remaining Father, thus appears as Son and Holy Spirit.

by the equality established between the three aspects, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The Father, as such, was not the source of the Trinity: He was made a secondary and temporary modality: the subordination doctrine was thus ruined in its very foundation.[1]

Such was the system, or at least something similar, which spread in Egypt and in the Pentapolis under the episcopate of Heraclas and of Dionysius. To refute it, the latter wrote several letters,[2] one of which, sent to Ammonius and Euphranor, two Bishops of the Pentapolis, displeased by its tenor the orthodox of Alexandria. Dionysius was denounced to the Pope of the same name. Letters were exchanged on both sides, about the years 259–261, and the Patriarch had to justify himself. St. Athanasius, who composed a whole treatise to vindicate the memory of his predecessor,[3] and St. Basil[4] have left us a portion unfortunately too meagre of the documents concerning that affair; however, it enables us to grasp sufficiently the features of that doctrinal discussion and to appreciate the theological position of the personages who took part in it.

The charges brought against Dionysius of Alexandria were very plain: he was accused of having separated too much and divided the Son from the Father: διαιρεῖ καὶ μακρύνει, καὶ μερίζει τὸν υἱὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρός;[5] of denying God's eternal fatherhood and the Son's eternal existence: οὐκ ἀεὶ ἦν ὁ θεὸς πατήρ· οὐκ ἀεὶ ἦν ὁ υἱός . . . ἦν ποτὲ ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, οὐ γάρ ἀΐδιός ἐστιν;[6] of not saying that the Son is ὁμοούσιος with God:

---

[1] Harnack, *Lehrb. der D G.*, I, 724; *History of Dogma*, vol. III, p. 87.

[2] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, VII, 26, 1.

[3] St. Athanasius, *De sententia Dionysii; De decretis nicaenae synodi*, 26; *De synodis*.

[4] *Epist.* IX, 2; *De Spiritu Sancto*, XXIX, 72.

[5] *De sent. Dionys.*, 16.

[6] *De sent. Dionys.*, 14.

ὡς οὐ λέγοντος τὸν Χριστὸν ὁμοούσιον εἶναι τῷ θεῷ;[1] finally of representing the Son as a mere adopted Son, a creature foreign to the Father in His nature, and of using offensive comparisons to express their relations: v. g., the Father is the husbandman, the Son is the vine; the Father is the carpenter, the Son, the boat He has made: *ποίημα καὶ γεννητὸν εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, μήτε δὲ φύσει ἴδιον, ἀλλὰ ξένον κατ' οὐσίαν αὐτὸν εἶναι τοῦ πατρός, ὥςπερ ἐστὶν ὁ γεωργὸς πρὸς τὸν ἄμπελον καὶ ὁ ναυπηγὸς πρὸς τὸ σκάφος, καὶ γὰρ ὡς ποίημα ὢν οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γένηται.*[2] This last phrase, taken from the letter to Euphranor, contained after all nothing short of Arianism.

Immediate steps had to be taken. This was done in two letters from Dionysius of Rome to whom the accusation had been brought: one, private, for the Patriarch alone, asking him to clear himself; the other, for the public at large, formulating what the Pope thought was the true doctrine. Of the latter — the more important — a portion has been fortunately reproduced by St. Athanasius in his *De decretis nicaenae synodi*, 26.

First the Pope threw aside Sabellianism, then condemned those who divided the divine monarchy into three separate hypostases and divinities, into three hypostases foreign one to the other: *εἰς τρεῖς δυνάμεις τινὰς καὶ μεμερισμένας ὑποστάσεις καὶ θεότητας τρεῖς . . . εἰς τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις ξένας ἀλλήλων παντάπασι κεχωρισμένας.* On the contrary, he went on, the trinity must be reduced to unity, it must be gathered up and brought together, as in a summit, in one who is the God of the universe: *τὴν θείαν τριάδα εἰς ἕνα, ὥσπερ εἰς κορυφήν τινα*

---

[1] *De sent. Dionys.*, 18.

[2] *De sent. Dionys.*, 4. ("The Son is a work and a creature of God, not appertaining to Him by nature, but in his essence as foreign to God as the vinedresser is to the vine, the shipbuilder to the ship; for, inasmuch as he was a creature, he did not exist prior to his creation.").

(τὸν θεὸν τῶν ὅλων τὸν παντοκράτορα λέγω) συγκεφαλαιοῦσθαι τε καὶ συνάγεσθαι πᾶσα ἀνάγχη. Then he condemned the intolerable error, as he says, of those who regard the Son as a creature and who supposed that there was a time when He did not exist; he concluded in these words: "We must neither divide the Wonderful and Divine Monad into three divinities, nor destroy the dignity and exceeding greatness of the Lord by thinking Him a creature: but we must have faith in God the Father Almighty, and in Christ Jesus His Son, and in the Holy Ghost, and in the union of the Word with the God of the universe, for *the Father and I*, He says, *are but one*, and *I am in the Father and the Father is in me*. Thus both the divine trinity and the holy preaching of the monarchy will be safeguarded."

In this way the Pope kept clear of Sabellianism, Tritheism, and Arianism. He said nothing of the ὁμοούσιος: and while his colleague of Alexandria avoided it, the Pope on the other hand was not willing to adopt it. Then no word was uttered against Subordinationism properly so called; but the doctrine of the Son's temporal generation was implicitly condemned or given up. Without distinguishing between the inner and the uttered Word, between the Son's conception and birth, St. Dionysius simply stated that the *Son* had always existed, although being in the Father's bosom: εἰ γὰρ γέγονεν ὁ υἱὸς, ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν· ἀεὶ δὲ ἦν εἴ γε ἐν τῷ πατρί ἐστιν.

Dionysius of Alexandria replied to the Pope in two letters. The first, written forthwith, was only the sketch of a self-defence;[1] the second, in four books, composed at leisure and entitled Ἔλεγχος καὶ ἀπολογία, set forth a formal justification. Of the latter we have still some fragments, of which we subjoin an analysis.

First the Patriarch denies rejecting the Son's eternity: far from rejecting it, he had proclaimed it and proved it by the same argument as Origen had done: God is the eternal light, the Son is the brightness of that light; now light always shines; therefore the Son is eternal as God Himself: *Οὐ γὰρ ἦν ὅτε ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἦν πατήρ . . . ὄντος οὖν αἰωνίου τοῦ πατρός, αἰώνιος ὁ υἱός ἔστι, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς ὤν.*[1] Then, when he comes to the charge of discarding the consubstantiality of the Father and of the Son, Dionysius observes that, although he had most assuredly used by the way (*ἐξ ἐπιδρομῆς*) some inaccurate comparisons to show the relations of the Father and of the Son, yet elsewhere also he had insisted on other comparisons more appropriate, such as that of parents and of children, of the root and of the plant, of the spring and of the river. If he had not employed the word *ὁμοούσιος*, it was not because he refused to accept its meaning, but because he had not found it in Scripture.[2] Then resuming the simile of the mind and of the word, a simile already proposed by St. Justin and Tertullian, he strives to state it with precision and to correct it: "The mind," he says, "produces the word and manifests itself in it; the word reveals the mind in which it is produced; the mind is as it were the inner word; the word is the mind springing without . . . Thus the mind is like the father of the word and exists in it; the word is as the daughter of the mind. . . Although distinct one from the other, they are one in the other; although two, they are one (*ἕν εἰσιν, ὄντες δύο*): thus the Father and the Son have been said to be one and moreover the one in the other (*ἓν καὶ ἐν ἀλλήλοις*)."[3] The charge of separating and dividing the Father from the Son and the Holy Spirit was no better grounded: for "it is thus," the Patriarch replies, "that we expand into trinity the indivisible unity, and we reduce to unity the trinity that cannot be diminished:" *οὕτω μὲν ἡμεῖς* εἴς τε τὴν τριάδα τὴν μονάδα πλατύνομεν ἀδιαίρετον, καὶ τὴν τριάδα πάλιν ἀμείωτον εἰς τὴν μονάδα συνκεφαλαιούμεθα.[1] As to making God the Son's Creator (ποιητὴν καὶ δημιουργόν), Dionysius affirmed he had never intended to do so: God is the Father, not the Creator, of the Son. Besides, the word ποιητής can admit of a broader meaning: thus authors are said to be the creators (ποιηταί) of their speeches, though in reality they are only their fathers.[2]

---

[1] *De sent. Dionys.*, 18.

---

[1] *De sent. Dionys.*, 15.

[2] *De sent. Dionys.*, 18.

[3] *De sent. Dionys.*, 23.

Such is, in the abstract, the defence opposed by Dionysius of Alexandria to his accusers. Was there actually in his case, nothing but precipitancy and carelessness in the choice of expressions, as he pretends? Perhaps, St. Athanasius excuses him, by saying that, after the example of the Apostles, he spoke κατ' οἰκονομίαν, insisting on the truth he was anxious to inculcate.[3] St. Basil is more severe.[4] In any case, and if there had been a real defection, the disciple of Origen had quickly recovered his self-possession. Distinction of persons, unity, consubstantiality, circumincession, generation of the Word by the mind, — nothing was lacking for the orthodoxy of his teaching. True he admitted three hypostases, and it seems that his adversaries did not fully agree with him on the legitimacy of that expression;[5] but neither are we told that St. Dionysius of Rome condemned it. What the Pope objected to, and what his colleague of Alexandria likewise rejected, was three hypostases divided and separated one from the other.

As regards the teaching of the Patriarch especially about the Holy Ghost, it was, according to St. Basil,[6] quite imperfect, going to the length of denying His divinity and reducing Him to the rank of subject and created beings. While he expressed these criticisms, St. Basil had probably in mind some texts like the one found in the 2nd Book of the Apology.[1] However we do not find that the Alexandrians ever brought an accusation in this regard against their Patriarch, and as far as we know them, the writings of St. Dionysius do not supply any grounds for a charge of that nature. Nay, St. Basil himself has drawn from our author, in behalf of the divinity of the Holy Spirit, three texts he has inserted in his treatise.[2]

---

[1] *De sent. Dionys.*, 17.

[2] *De sent. Dionys.*, 20, 21.

[3] *De sent. Dionys.*, 6–12.

[4] *Epist.* IX, 2.

[5] St. Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto*, XXIX, 72.

[6] *Epist.* IX, 2; *De Spiritu Sancto*, XXIX, 72.

§ 2. — Theognostus[3] and Pierius.

Immediately after Dionysius, or even perhaps together with him, we must mention Theognostus as leader of the school of Alexandria, about the years 264–280. He is known to have composed a work, the *Hypotyposes*, in seven books, which Photius read and analyzed,[4] and the doctrine of which gave him offence in several points. He reproaches the author with having drawn from Origen's *Περὶ ἀρχῶν* many errors; such as that of calling the Son *κτίσμα*, of extending His influence only to the *λογικά*, of lowering the Holy Ghost, of ascribing a body to angels and to demons, etc. St. Gregory of Nyssa has likewise discovered in his works the germs of the heresy of Eunomius about the Son's creation;[5] and these judgments of antiquity have been reëchoed in the note that precedes the fragment of the *Hypotyposes* edited by Diekamp: "It is to be remarked that in several other [passages], this author (Theognostus) utters blasphemies about the Son of God and about the Holy Spirit." However, the three extracts from Theodotus that have been preserved by St. Athanasius,[1] as well as that of Diekamp, show him in a better light. Side by side with clearly subordinationist notions, the author proclaims the origin of the Son *ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας*, His full and perfect likeness to the Father in the essence (*ἔχων τὴν ὁμοιότητα τοῦ πατρὸς κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν . . . πλήρη . . . ἀκριβῆ*), the Father moreover undergoing no decrease, through the generation of the Son. As to the Holy Spirit, he regards Him particularly as the source of knowledge and the principle of grace imparted to the *perfect*.

---

[1] *De sent. Dionys.*, 17.

[2] *De Spiritu Sancto*, XXIX, 72.

[3] Fragments in *P. G.*, X, 235, ff.; Routh, *Reliquiae sacrae*, 2nd edit., vol. III, 405–422; Fr. Diekamp, *Ein neues Fragment aus den Hypotyposen des Alexandriners Theognostus*, in the *Theol. Quartalschr.*, LXXXIV, 1902, pp. 481–494.

[4] *Biblioth.*, cod. 106.

[5] *Contra Eunomium*, III, Or. 3.

We do not know whether Pierius[2] immediately replaced Theognostus as leader of the catechetical school of Alexandria. Anyhow, his literary activity must be assigned to the thirty years' period that goes from about the year 280 to the year 310. That activity was of no small amount; he had written much, and his talent, according to St. Jerome,[3] had caused him to be called "the younger Origen." The *Codex Baroccianus 142* ascribes to him a work with this or a similar title *Περὶ τῆς θεοτόκου*.[4] Photius[5] who had read a collection of twelve of his treatises tells us that his teaching about the Father and the Son was accurate, though his style was somewhat archaic; but as to the Holy Ghost, his views were dangerous and incorrect (*ἐπισφαλῶς λίαν καὶ δυσσεβῶς δογματίζει*), for the Holy Spirit was represented as inferior in glory to the Father and to the Son. Moreover, Photius continues, Pierius seems to have admitted the preëxistence of souls, while, on the other hand, his writing about St. Luke has a testimony in behalf of the veneration of images. This is all that we can know of the theology of Pierius, the few fragments that remain of his works exhibiting no doctrinal character. On the whole, Theognostus and his successor continued to walk along the path marked out by Origen: side by side with a teaching concerning the Trinity that is substantially correct, objectionable words might be found in their writings, as well as a subordinationism which needed correction.

---

[1] *De decretis nicaenae synodi*, 25; *Epist. ad Serapionem*, IV, 11; cf. *P. G.*, X, 240, 241.

[2] Fragments in *P. G.*, X, 241–246; and C. DE BOOR, *Neue Fragmente des Papias, Hegesippus und Pierius, Texte und Untersuch.*, V, 2, Leipsic, 1888. Cf. HARNACK, *Gesch. der altchr. Litter., Die Ueberlief.*, pp. 439, 440.

[3] *De viris illustr.*, 76.

[4] HARNACK, *Gesch. der altchr. Litter., Die Ueberlief.*, pp. 439, 440.

[5] *Biblioth.*, cod. 119.

§ 3. — St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, Hieracas.

St. Gregory Thaumaturgus [1] did not occupy Origen's chair either at Alexandria or at Cæsarea; however, he was one of his most enthusiastic disciples, and the passage of his *Oratio panegyrica*, in which he describes the master's methods and the training he had received from him, may be reckoned among the most interesting pages bequeathed us by Christian antiquity.

Together with Origen, Gregory tells us, he had much read the philosophers, and these of all schools, except the Atheists.[2] He seems to have retained from these readings a tendency to insist on the unity of God, a tendency which his life spent in the midst of half-heathen populations could but increase. There are traces of it in the *Treatise to Theopompus on the impassibility and passibility of God*, which probably may be ascribed to him, and perhaps there were also in the *Dialogue with Ælianus*, which is known to us only through St. Basil.

---

[1] The edition quoted is that of *P. G.*, X. For the *Treatise to Theopompus*, cf. P. DE LAGARDE, *Analecta syriaca*, Leipsic, 1858, or PITRA, *Analecta sacra*, IV, Paris, 1883. — Works: V. RYSSEL, *Gregorius Thaumaturgus, sein Leben und seine Schriften*, Leipsic, 1880. KOETSCHAU, *Des Gregorios Thaumaturgos Dankrede an Origenes*, Friburg in Brisgau, 1894.

[2] *Orat. panegyr.*, 13.

Although the great Cappadocian Bishop testified on several occasions to the perfect orthodoxy of the Thaumaturgus,[1] yet he had to defend it against the Sabellians. These pretended to put themselves under the cover of his authority and quoted from him the formula *πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν ἐπινοίᾳ μὲν εἶναι δυο, ὑποστάσει δὲ ἕν* of his *Dialogue with Ælianus.* St. Basil replies that Gregory, arguing in that place against a Heathen, used that expression *ἀγωνιστικῶς*, not *δογματικῶς*, naturally insisting on the divine unity. He adds that we must excuse by the same consideration the expressions *κτίσμα, ποίημα*, applied to the Son, expressions which besides referred simply to the incarnate Christ; and finally that the text of the work is considerably altered.[2]

On the other hand, there still remains a monument of St. Gregory's Trinitarian orthodoxy: we mean his *Ἔκθεσις πίστεως*, of which the authenticity seems definitively established and which is to be ascribed probably to the years 260–270. The Word is said *θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ . . . υἱὸς ἀληθινὸς ἀληθινοῦ πατρός . . . καὶ ἀΐδιος ἀϊδίου*; the Holy Spirit, *ἐκ θεοῦ τὴν ὕπαρξιν ἔχον . . . εἰκὼν τοῦ υἱοῦ τελείου τελεία, ζωὴ ζώντων αἰτία*; the Trinity, *τριὰς τελεία, δόξῃ καὶ ἀϊδιότητι καὶ βασιλείᾳ μὴ μεριζομένη μηδὲ ἀπαλλοτριουμένη.* The author concludes as follows: "Wherefore there is nothing either created or in servitude in the Trinity (*οὔτε οὖν κτιστόν τι, ἢ δοῦλον ἐν τῇ τριάδι*); nor anything superinduced, as if at some former period it was non-existent, and at some later period it was introduced. And thus neither was the Son ever wanting to the Father, nor the Spirit to the Son; but without variation and without change, the same Trinity abideth ever." This formula, clearly affirming, together with the distinction of persons, their eternity and equality, the immortality and the perfection not only of the Father, but also of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, constitutes a manifest progress on the theories of the *Περὶ ἀρχῶν*.

---

[1] *Epist.* XXVIII, 1, 2; CCIV, 2; CCVII, 4.

[2] *Epist.* CCX, 5.

It is not certain that Hieracas,[1] the well-read ascetic of Leontopolis in Egypt, was, like Gregory, Origen's pupil, for he may have borrowed something of the latter's errors, even though he did not follow his public lessons.[2] The teaching of Hieracas about the Word was correct: he believed, St. Epiphanius relates, that the Son is truly born from the Father, and that from Him too the Holy Ghost originates (*ἐκ πατρὸς εἶναι*).[3] On the other hand, we know that Arius opposed his own doctrine to that of our author: he reproached him for saying that the Son was as regards the Father *λύχνον ἀπὸ λύχνου, ἢ ὡς λαμπάδα εἰς δύο*,[4] or, as St. Hilary explains, that the Father and the Son were like two lamps fed by the same oil, the second however being derived from the first.[5] This is the unity of nature; but Arius, who knew that the teaching of Hieracas was open to the suspicion of the orthodox in other regards, hoped, by that opposition, to throw the Church authorities on the wrong scent in regard to his own teaching.

As a matter of fact, Hieracas fell into serious errors on other points. He identified the Holy Spirit with Melchizedek, who was without father or mother, likened to the Son of God;[6] he rejected the resurrection of the body and condemned matrimony. This prohibition, he went on to declare, was *the* novelty Jesus Christ had brought upon earth by His incarnation. Authorized in the Old Covenant, forbidden in the New, matrimony had been tolerated by St. Paul (1 *Corinth.*, 7^2) merely *propter fornicationem*, for fear of a greater evil; but no one could, without continence, obtain life and get into the kingdom of Heaven.[1] Hieracas debarred also from Heaven the baptized children that died before being able to perform good works.[2] So, the general tenor of his doctrine, as well as of his life, was hard and austere. His disciples rigorously practised abstinence and chastity.[3]

---

[1] Source: St. Epiphanius, *Haer.* LXVII; LXIX, 7; LV, 5.

[2] St. Epiphanius, *Haer.* LXVII, 1, 2.

[3] *Ibid.*, 2, 3.

[4] St. Athanasius, *De synodis*, 16; St. Epiphanius, *Haer.* LXIX, 7.

[5] St. Hilary, *De Trinitate*, VI, 5, 12.

[6] St. Epiphanius, *Haer.* LXVII, 3; LV, 5.

§ 4. — Writers independent of or opposed to Origen. St. Peter of Alexandria.[4]

If Origen had warm admirers and disciples, there arose also — and without delay — a certain number of theologians to whom his views gave offence. In his lifetime, he was obliged to write to Pope Fabian (244–249) and to several Bishops to defend his orthodoxy.[5] Less than fifty years after his death, that orthodoxy found, at Alexandria itself, a first adversary in Peter, the Bishop of the city.

Peter had probably been head of the catechetical school; in the year 300, he became Patriarch, and in the year 311, received the martyr's crown. Of his works, we have but short fragments, which, however, suffice to indicate the character of his attitude towards Origen. In his Περὶ ψυχῆς, he protested against some allegorical interpretations of Genesis, and against the opinion that regarded souls as existing before bodies, and their union with bodies as a consequence of their sin.[6] That opinion of the preëxistence of souls, he added, was a Greek doctrine, foreign to Christianity.[7] The same attitude manifests itself in the fragments of his treatise *On the Resurrection*, where he insists on the material identity of the risen body and of the buried body, for the resurrection can be truly such, only if the very being that was dead comes back to life.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, 1, 2.

[2] *Ibid.*, 2.

[3] *Ibid.*, 3, 8.

[4] The edition quoted is that of *P. G.*, XVIII; for the fragments of the treatise *On the Resurrection*, that of PITRA, *Analecta sacra*, IV, 189–193, 426–429; cf. HARNACK, *Gesch. der altchr. Litter.*, *Die Ueberlief.*, 446.

[5] EUSEBIUS, *Eccl. Hist.*, VI, 36, 4.

[6] *P. G.*, XVIII, 520, 521.

[7] HARNACK, *Gesch. der altchr. Litter.*, *Die Ueberl.*, p. 447.

From the other fragments of Peter that have reached us, we may draw chiefly a witness in behalf of the presence of two natures in Jesus Christ: "He was God by nature," he writes, "and He became man by nature: *Θεὸς ἦν φύσει, καὶ γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος φύσει;*"[1] although the Word, in becoming man, did not lay aside His divinity.[2] As to the fourteen penitential canons which Peter has left,[3] they are of interest for the history of penance in Alexandria, at the beginning of the fourth century. We see from them that the Patriarch admits to reconciliation the repentant *lapsi*, after an expiation more or less prolonged, — of four years, at most.

§ 5. — St. Methodius of Olympus.[4]

We know scarcely anything about the life of St. Methodius, Bishop of Olympus in Lycia, martyred, like St. Peter of Alexandria, about the year 311; but his many writings or fragments of writings which are still extant enable us to get a fair idea of his character and of his teaching. Although Methodius does not possess a superior mind, yet he is a well cultivated writer, fond of philosophy and natural sciences, an earnest inquirer and a sincere controversialist, a theologian firmly grounded upon tradition, who is after all the first man of his age, since that age did not witness any truly great man. His general tendencies are decidedly anti-Origenistic, not that he did not learn a great deal from Origen, but that he often turned against the master what he had received from him. Soon after they appeared, his works were neglected by the Greek world, because of their "archaisms of thought and expression;" however, they have been recovered in part in Slavic translations.

---

[1] *P. G.*, XVIII, 512, 521.

[2] *P. G.*, XVIII, 509.

[3] *P. G.*, XVIII, 468.

[4] The edition quoted is, for the *Banquet*, that of *P. G.*, XVIII; for the other works and fragments, that of G. N. Bonwetsch, *Methodius von Olympus*, I, *Schriften*, Erlangen and Leipsic, 1891. — Works: A. Pankow, *Methodius von Olympos*, Mentz, 1888. G. Fritschel, *Methodius von Olympus und seine Philosophie*, Leipsic, 1879. C. Carel, *S. Methodii Patarensis Convivium decem virginum*, Paris, 1880. G. N. Bonwetsch, art. *Methodius* in the *Realencykl. für prot. Theol.*, 3rd edit., vol. XIII, Leipsic, 1903.

In his Trinitarian teaching, Methodius formally acknowledges the full divinity of the Word, Son of God "by whom all was made,"[1] not an adopted Son, but the eternal Son, who never began and shall never cease to be Son,[2] Word before the rise of time, to whom prayers are offered up.[3] However Photius observed that *The Banquet* contains some Arian expressions, and thought that the text had been altered.[4] Then a few subordinationist words are detected elsewhere.[5] As to the Holy Ghost, He is, according to the Bishop of Olympus, the ἐκπορευτὴ ὑπόστασις that comes from the Father, as Eve came from Adam.[6]

God has created the world, and although He carried it eternally within Himself *in posse*, yet He created it in time.[7] This world is summed up in man, the microcosm.[8] Man is characterized by freedom:[9] he was made immortal and according to God's likeness: *ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ἔκτισε τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπὶ ἀφθαρσίᾳ, καὶ εἰκόνα τῆς ἰδίας ἀϊδιότητος ἐποίησεν αὐτόν . . . τὸ θεοειδὲς καὶ θεοείκελον.*[1] Our author opposes the preëxistence of souls and the doctrine of a sin previous to their union with the body.[2] As regards actual sin, although the devil, he says, prompts us to it and has breathed corruption into us, by bringing about Adam's fall,[3] yet that sin originates in reality from the inclinations of the flesh.[4] It is our duty to withstand those inclinations,[5] until death rids us of this flesh, for death is a grace of renewal.[6]

---

[1] *On the Leech*, VII, 3.

[2] *Banquet*, VIII, 9.

[3] *Banquet*, III, 4; VII, 1; XI, 2; *On Leprosy*, XI, 4; *On the Resurrection*, III, 23, 11.

[4] *Biblioth.*, cod. 237.

[5] *De creatis*, IX, XI; cf. PHOTIUS, *Biblioth.*, cod. 235; *Banquet*, III, 4, 6; VII, 1.

[6] Fragment IV, edit. BONWETSCH, 355.

[7] *De libero arbitrio*, XXII, 9–11; *De creatis*, II, XI.

[8] *De resurrect.*, II, 10, 2.

[9] *De libero arbitrio*, XVI, 2, 7; *De resurr.*, I, 38, 3; I, 57, 6; *Banquet*, III, 17.

Death is then both a consequence and a remedy of sin. But, in order that it might not become everlasting, and Satan might be conquered by the very one he had seduced,[7] the Word was made man (*ἐνανθρωπήσας*).[8] This union of the Word and of humanity is intimate (*συνενώσας καὶ συγκεράσας*),[9] though Jesus Christ remains both God and man (*ἄνθρωπον ἀκράτῳ θεότητι καὶ τελείᾳ πεπληρωμένον, καὶ θεὸν ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ κεχωρημένον*),[10] and the body of Jesus Christ is like ours, since it is to save ours.[11] It remained real after the resurrection as during the transfiguration.[12] However, the chief idea of Methodius on this point, an idea he borrowed from the Asiatic school to which he belonged, is that of the *recapitulation*. Jesus Christ is the second Adam, in whom our humanity was fashioned again and united to the Word. Our author goes so far as to seem to identify absolutely Christ with the person of the first Adam.[1]

---

[1] *De resurrect.*, I, 35, 2; I, 36, 2; I, 34, 3; I, 52, 5.

[2] *De resurrect.*, I, 55, 4.

[3] *De libero arbitr.*, XVII, 4, 5; XVIII, 4, ff.; *De resurrect.*, II, 6, 2.

[4] *De resurrect.*, II, 4, 3.

[5] *De resurrect.*, II, 4, 3.

[6] *De resurrect.*, II, 6, 3; I, 39, 5; I, 38, 1; I, 43, 2 and foll.

[7] *Banquet*, III, 6.

[8] *Banquet*, I, 5; VIII, 7; X, 2.

[9] *Banquet*, III, 5.

[10] *Banquet*, III, 4.

[11] *De resurrect.*, II, 8, 7.

[12] *De resurrect.*, III, 7, 12; III, 12, 3 and foll.

After thus becoming the leader of mankind and our representative, Jesus Christ suffers for us, and cleanses us with His blood.[2] He is our help, our advocate, our physician,[3] who brings us forgiveness of sin, truth, immortality, the resurrection of the body.[4] That work of Jesus Christ is fulfilled in the Church and through the Church, His spouse, who bears children to Him constantly.[5] The instrument of this renewal and generation is Baptism.[6] Baptism makes not only Saints, but Christs, for every faithful, participating with Christ, is himself a begotten Christ,[7] and the function of the Church consists in producing the Word in the hearts of the faithful.[8]

The moral doctrine of Methodius is wholly religious, and starts from the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ as the principle of all good. True faith and works, the fulfilment of precepts, are deemed equally necessary;[9] as regards sins, we are advised in case of fall to do penance for them, for God is full of mercy and inclined to forgive them and cleanse us from them.[10] Then to the precepts, strictly so called, a certain number of aphorisms and counsels of ascetic life are added, that are partly borrowed from Origen and somewhat inspired with Stoicism. Suffering is a means of purification;[11]

---

[1] *Banquet*, III, 3, 4, 5, 8.

[2] *On the Distinction of Meats*, XV, XI, 4.

[3] *De resurrect.*, III, 23, 11.

[4] *Banquet*, VII, 6; *De resurrect.*, II, 18, 8; II, 24, 4; III, 23, 4, 6.

[5] *Banquet*, III, 8.

[6] *Banquet*, VIII, 6, 8; *On the Distinction of Meats*, XI, 6.

[7] Ὅπως ἕκαστος τῶν ἁγίων, τῷ μετέχειν Χριστοῦ, Χριστὸς γεννηθῇ (*Banquet*, VIII, 8, 9; *On the Leech*, VIII, 2, 3; *On the Distinction of Meats*, IV, 1).

[8] *Banquet*, VIII, 11.

[9] *De resurrect.*, I, 30, 2; III, 23, 11; *On Leprosy*, XV, 2; *On the Leech*, VIII, 4.

[10] *De resurrect.*, III, 21, 9; III, 23, 7–9.

[11] *On the Distinction of Meats*, I–V.

during this short life of ours, the objects we use do not belong to us, we merely borrow them;[1] above all, among all the virtues, virginity is extolled as the most beautiful, *τὸ κορυφαιότατον καὶ μακάριον ἐπιτήδευμα*,[2] as *the* virtue of Jesus Christ, the *ἀρχιπαρθένος*.[3] Still, marriage is not forbidden.[4]

Methodius has composed a whole treatise on the resurrection of bodies: in it, he emphatically sets aside the resurrection understood in the Origenistic sense, as a kind of merely spiritual resurrection. Man, he declares, is not to be transformed into an angel, but is to be immortal in what he is:[5] the body that will rise again is the one we have now.[6] Moreover, as we might expect, the Bishop of Olympus is a Millenarian. He thinks the world will last six thousand years, and after that the just will rise and reign for one thousand years with Jesus Christ before entering Heaven.[7] Creation itself will be renewed and purified by fire, to last forever.

After what has just been said, it is easy to characterize in two words the theology of Methodius. From a negative standpoint, so to speak, it is decidedly and consciously anti-Origenistic; from a positive standpoint, it reproduces the special ideas and theories to which the Asiatic school (Irenæus, Melito) was attached. Its general tendency is conservative; although it has been somewhat influenced by Philosophy, and, while its author rejects the principle of allegorism,[8] yet, in case of need, he is not slow to use this kind of interpretation.[9]

---

[1] *On Life and Rational Action*, V, 1; VI, 3.

[2] *Banquet*, VIII, 1; VII, 3.

[3] *Banquet*, I, 5.

[4] *Banquet*, II, 1, 2; III, 11 and foll.

[5] *De resurrect.*, I, 49, 3, 4; I, 50, 1.

[6] *De resurrect.*, III, 1, 1; III, 2, 2, 3; III, 3; III, 5, 7; III, 12.

[7] *Banquet*, IX, 1, 5.

[8] *Banquet*, III, 2; *De resurrect.*, I, 39, 2; I, 54, 6; III, 9, 4.

[9] *De resurrect.*, III, 8, 3, 7; *On Leprosy*, IV, 5.

§ 6. — The Dialogue *De recta in Deum fide.*[1]

We must place between the years 280–311 the composition of the anonymous dialogue Περὶ τῆς εἰς θεὸν ὀρθῆς πίστεως which, because of the chief speaker's name, Adamantius, was quite early, though wrongly, ascribed to Origen. The writing has for its aim to refute Marcionitism and Valentinianism in their various shapes. But, while engaged in that task, the author, under the name of Adamantius, exposes his own doctrine, and of this we intend to say a few words. Although that doctrine is independent of Origen's doctrine and often differs from it, yet it does not aim precisely at opposing the teaching of the Alexandrian master. The following are its chief features.

There is but one God, both just and kind, creator of the world, and of prime matter itself (VI, 4), author of the two Covenants. Evil does not exist in itself, nor is it a substance: it is an accident, the result of angelic and human freedom: the essential good cannot be the author nor the subject thereof; participated good alone is capable of it, because of its freedom (III, 8, 9, 10, 13; IV, 10, 11; cf. I, 28).

Then Adamantius professes his faith in the eternal and consubstantial Word, and in the Holy Spirit likewise eternal: *Πεπίστευκα καὶ τὸν ἐξ αὐτοῦ θεὸν λόγον ὁμοούσιον ἀεὶ ὄντα . . . Πιστεύω δὲ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι τῷ ἀεὶ ὄντι* (I, 2). The word ὁμοούσιος should be noticed. The Word, he goes on, is Son of God by nature, *κατὰ φύσιν*, in opposition to men who are such only through adoption, *κατὰ θέσιν* (III, 9). Now this Word took, from the Virgin Mary an earthly flesh, the flesh of Adam (V, 3, 9; IV, 15). By this incarnation, He did not transform Himself into the flesh (IV, 16); the person that He was was neither changed nor destroyed: the same one who came down from Heaven ascended there: *ἀληθῶς γὰρ ὁ καταβὰς αὐτός ἐστι καὶ ὁ ἀναβάς, οὐδὲν ἄλλο γενόμενος ηαρ’ ὃ ἦν, θεός* (V, 7). These last words show us how loose the expression still remains, although the thought is correct. Elsewhere the duality in Christ of the two elements, divine and human, is affirmed (*ὄντως θεὸν κατὰ πνεῦμα καὶ ὄντως ἄνθρωπον κατὰ σάρκα ὁμολογήσαντες Χριστόν*, V, 11), although in such terms that the humanity seems to be a person distinct from the Word: Ὁ *τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος κατελθὼν ἀνέλαβεν ἄνθρωπον . . . καὶ οὗτος ὁ ληφθεὶς . . . οὗτος ὑπέμεινε πάντα τὰ ἀνθρώπινα πάθη, ἵνα τὸν ἄνθρωπον σώσῃ* (V, 8).

---

[1] The edition quoted is that of W. H. Van de Sande Bakhuizen, *DerDialog des Adamantius*, Leipsic, 1901.

Adamantius rejects expressly the peculiar soteriological theory of Origen, who holds that the blood of Jesus Christ was a price paid to the devil for the redemption of our souls: this is, he exclaims, nothing short of an absurd blasphemy: *πολλὴ βλάσφημος ἄνοια*! The meaning of that *λύτρωσις* is rather that Jesus Christ redeemed us from the slavery of sin, for, having committed sin, we had become its slaves; however, this redemption must be metaphorically (*καταχρηστικῶς*) understood, since, besides, the Saviour resumed the life He had given for us (I, 27).

Like Methodius, our author does not admit the preëxistence of souls, nor their sin before their union with the body, nor the view that this union was the punishment of their fault (V, 21). On the other hand, he teaches that the Catholic Church alone is the depositary of truth, and that by departing from her, one falls necessarily into error (V, 28); then he goes on to explain the word *Catholic*. True Christians are called Catholics, he says, because they are spread all over the world: *διὰ τὸ καθ’ ὅλον τοῦ κόσμου εἶναι* (I, 8). In a passage about the Eucharist (II, 20), the author designates the latter as the communion of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, and draws from this fact a proof that creation is the work of the good God: otherwise, there would be a close union between light — the body of Jesus Christ — and darkness — the Eucharistic elements.

The dialogue in question treats of Eschatology only incidentally. There are, we read, two comings of Jesus Christ: one, in humility, already fulfilled; the other, in glory, which will be realized at the end of time (I, 25). God, who is a just judge, will then treat everybody according to his merits and deeds (I, 16; II, 5, 15). As to the resurrection, it will take place in the very body which we now possess (V, 16); true, that body will be externally changed and transfigured; but it will keep its identity, and will not become another body: οὐκ ἕτερος γενόμενος . . . οὐκ ἄλλος παρ' ὃ πέφυκε μεταβαλλόμενος (V, 24).

CHAPTER XIII

THE EASTERN HERESIES OF THE END OF THE THIRD CENTURY

§ 1. — The Adoptianism of Paul of Samosata.[1]

PAUL of Samosata is known chiefly through the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius (VII, 27–30). Chosen about the year 260 to replace Demetrianus in the see of Antioch, he soon displayed the scandal, not only of a false teaching, but also of a life thoroughly worldly as well as haughty and violent in character. Three Councils met at Antioch against him from the year 263 to the year 268. The first two, presided over by Firmilian of Cæsarea, were fruitless. The third, held in the year 267 or 268, excommunicated the heretic and made its decision known to the Pope and to the Catholic world, by means of a letter, some fragments of which are still extant. The chief author of Paul's defeat in this last affair was a certain Malchion, a former leader of the Sophists' school, and later a priest of the Church of Antioch, who baffled his tactics and laid bare his errors. Although deposed, Paul succeeded in continuing to hold the church-buildings, owing to the help of Zenobia, queen of Palmyra. In the year 272, under Aurelian, he was driven from them once for all.

---

[1] Sources: first of all, the fragments either of the writings of Paul himself, or of the account of his discussion with Malchion, or of the synodal letter of the Council of Antioch in which he was condemned; all gathered in ROUTH, *Reliquiae sacrae*, 1st edit., III, 286–367. Cf. another fragment of the *Disputatio*, in PITRA, *Analecta sacra*, III, 600, 601 and also HARNACK, *Lehrb. der D G.*, I, p. 684, note 6; *Hist. of Dogma*, vol. III, p. 41, note 10. — Then, the information supplied by the writers of the 4th century: EUSEBIUS, *Eccl. Hist.*, VII, 27–30; ST. ATHANASIUS, *De Synodis*, 26, 43, 45, 51; *Oratio contra Arian.*, II, 43; the author (probably Didymus) of the *Contra Apollinarium*, II, 3; ST. HILARY, *De Synodis*, 81, 86; ST. GREGORY OF NYSSA, *Antirrhetic. contra Apoll.*, ix; ST. BASIL, *Epist.* LII; ST. EPIPHANIUS, *Haer.* LXV. — Works: A. RÉVILLE, *La Christologie de Paul de Samosate*, *Bibliothèque des Hautes Etudes*, *Section des sciences religieuses*, Paris, 1896.

His doctrine, on which we are well informed, was nothing but the Adoptianism of Theodotus and Artemon, but skilfully presented. It amounts to this: There is in God only one person (*πρόσωπον ἕν*);[1] however, we may distinguish in Him a reason (λόγος) and a wisdom (*σοφία*). That reason and that wisdom have no subsistence of their own: they are mere faculties or attributes (*ἀνυπόστατος*).[2] True, God utters His Word from all eternity, and thus the Word may be called Son; nevertheless the Word remains impersonal, as the human word.[3]

This Word, this divine reason, acted in Moses, in the Prophets, but chiefly and in a most especial way in the Son of David,[4] in Jesus, born of the Virgin through the operation of the Holy Ghost.[5] Jesus is only a man:[6] He is "from below" (*κάτωθεν*);[7] but the Word inspired Him from above (*ἐν αὐτῷ ἐνέπνευσεν ἄνωθεν ὁ λόγος*),[8] and by inspiring Him, became united to Him: a union of mere external action (*ἔξωθεν*),[9] — or if some prefer — of indwelling, the impersonal Logos being contained in Jesus as in a temple (*ὡς ἐν ναῷ*),[10] a union which is a mere *συνέλευσις*,[11] and does not result in Jesus being God in person (ἄλλος γάρ ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ ἄλλος ὁ λόγος);[1] nor does it give to the Word the personality which is lacking to it — for it is not an essence subsisting in a body (οὐσία οὐσιωμένη ἐν σώματι),[2] — but only the reason of God, whose light is imparted to Mary's Son κατὰ μάθησιν καὶ μετουσίαν . . . κατὰ ποιότητα.[3]

---

[1] St. Epiphan., *Haer.* LXV, 3.

[2] St. Epiphan., *Haer.* LXV, 1, 5.

[3] Routh, *l. c.*, 300; St. Epiphan., *l. c.*, 3.

[4] Routh, *l. c.*, 301, 311.

[5] Routh, *l. c.*, 300.

[6] St. Epiphan., *l. c.*, 7; cf. 1, and Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, VII, 27, 2.

[7] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, VII, 30, 11, and cf. VII, 27, 2; St. Epiphan., *l. c.*, 7.

[8] St. Epiphan., *l. c.*, 7; *Contra Apoll.*, II, 3.

[9] Routh, *l. c.*, 311.

[10] Routh, *l. c.*, 301; St. Epiphan., *l. c.*, 1.

[11] Routh, *l. c.*, 324.

Yet, for that very communication, Jesus is a being unique and without equal.[4] Anointed by the Holy Ghost at His Baptism, He has reached moral perfection.[5] His love of God is unfailing, His will sinless: — an excellence, Paul observes, far higher than that which would accrue to Him from nature. As a reward of that uprightness, God granted Him the power to perform miracles. Jesus Christ triumphs over sin, not only in Himself, but in us: He redeems and saves us, at the same time that He makes His union with God indissoluble.

Then His apotheosis takes place. The purity of His life, as well as His sufferings, deserves for Him a name above all name;[6] He is established judge of the living and of the dead, clad with the divine dignity, so that we may truly call Him "God born of a Virgin, God manifested from Nazareth," θεὸν ἐκ τῆς παρθένου, θεὸν ἐκ Ναζαρὲτ ὀφθέντα.[7]

In a similar sense we may speak also of His preëxistence: for Jesus did not exist before His birth substantially and personally (οὐσίᾳ καὶ ὑποστάσει); but He had been foreseen and predestined by God, announced and foretold by the Prophets, and thus He existed in a certain way in God's designs and in the prophecies that referred to His coming: *τῷ μὲν προορισμῷ πρὸ αἰώνων ὄντα.*[1]

---

[1] Routh, *l. c.*, 301, and cf. 312; St. Epiphan., *l. c.*, 7.

[2] Routh, *l. c.*, 312, 302.

[3] Routh, *l. c.*, 311, 312.

[4] Paul spoke even of a difference of constitution between Jesus Christ and us. (Routh, *l. c.*, 311.)

[5] For what follows, cf. the fragments of the *Discourses* of Paul to Sabinus in Routh, *l. c.*, 329, or better in Harnack, *Lehrb. der DG.*, I, 684, note 6; *Hist. of Dogma*, vol. III, p. 41, note 10.

[6] *Fragm.* 3, to Sabinus.

[7] *Contra Apollin.*, II, 3; cf. St. Gregory of Nyssa, *Antirrheticon*, IX; St. Athanasius, *De synodis*, 45, 26, IV.

Such is, in a few words, Paul's system: evidently it was nothing short of Adoptianism. Among the ideas which are most prominent in it, we may notice that of the value of personal deeds, opposed to the excellence resulting from nature alone. What comes from nature has nothing meritorious nor superior; it is the effort of the will, the personal merit that constitutes true greatness. Jesus is not God by nature: He is more than that; He has become such by His virtue. On the other hand, by its way of explaining the union of the man and of the Word, the system foreshadowed Nestorianism. This the adversaries of Paul soon noticed: hence he was often mentioned — and anathematized — in the subsequent Christological controversies.

The Bishops of the Council of Antioch condemned these doctrinal views. The fragments of their synodal letter, as they are preserved by Eusebius, unfortunately touch but very little the dogmatic side of the question.[2] On the other hand, we know an incident of that condemnation which was mentioned only later on and is of the highest importance. The Semi-Arians, gathered at Ancyra in the year 358, refused to receive the word *ὁμοούσιος*, on the ground that the term had been thrown aside by the Fathers who excommunicated Paul of Samosata, in as much as it did not fitly express the relations of the Father and of the Son. St. Athanasius (*De synodis*, 43, 45), St. Basil (*Epist.* LII, 1) and St. Hilary (*De synodis*, 81, 86), who record the objection, do not seem to deny the fact brought forward: but they claim that the Bishops of the Council of Antioch did not understand the word *ὁμοούσιος* in the same meaning as the Fathers of Nicæa. According to St. Athanasius and St. Basil, Paul raised against the essential divinity of Jesus Christ the following difficulty: If Jesus Christ did not, from man, as He had been, become God, He is not *ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρί*, and then there are three substances: one, principal; the other two derived therefrom: that is to say, as St. Hilary explains, in order that Jesus Christ may be *ὁμοούσιος* to the Father, what is divine in Him must be something impersonal, something which is not an *οὐσία* (in the sense of person, subsistence) other than the Father: otherwise we would be obliged to consider both of them as coming from a primitive *οὐσία* in which they would share. In this argument, *οὐσία* stood for *ὑπόστασις* in Paul's mind; and the Council rejected the *ὁμοούσιος* thus understood. That explanation is quite plausible, the more so that the words *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις* received only afterwards their determined and exclusive meaning.

---

[1] *Contra Apollin.*, II, 3.

[2] Another letter which is said to have been written by six Bishops present at the Council and is still extant (ROUTH, *l. c.*, 289, ff.) contains on the contrary about the divinity of Jesus Christ and against Paul's errors a detailed and documented profession of faith. But its authenticity is quite doubtful.

Through Paul of Samosata and his contemporary, Lucian of Antioch, Adoptianism joins hands with Arianism. The latter was to preserve the fundamental idea of the non-divinity of Jesus Christ, but to compromise in regard to the personality of the Logos, whom it represents as a superior being incarnate in Jesus.

§ 2. — **Manicheism.**[1]

Manicheism is not a Christian system nor a heresy, properly so called, and would have no title to be studied in a *history of*

---

[1] Sources: The sources that may serve for the history of the Manichean doctrine have been divided into two great categories: the *Oriental*, and the *Greek and Latin sources*. I. The *Oriental* sources, more important, include (1) the *Mohammedan* sources: KITAB-AL-FIHRIST (about 980), edit. G. FLUEGEL, Leipsic, 1871–1872. SHAHRASTANI (12th century), *Kitab-al-milal wan nuhal*,

Dogmas, had it not later on borrowed from Christianity, and given rise to many refutations on the part of ecclesiastical writers.

It appeared first in the East, and drew exclusively from Heathenism its fundamental doctrines. It comes from the old naturalistic religion of Babylonia and Chaldæa, completed by elements taken from Parsism and Mandæism. Now the latter was perhaps connected with Elkesaitism: at any rate, certain Christian practices and ideas had penetrated into it, and we may suppose — although the *fact* is not established — that, in that indirect way, some Christian element crept from the very start into Mani's system. As to Buddhism, to which Baur formerly ascribed a considerable influence in the formation of Manicheism, scholars are now inclined to regard that influence as of no importance.

Besides, it is no easy task, in presence of so many and various sources, to form a complete and reliable idea of Mani's life and teaching. The great outlines alone can aim at exactitude. Mani was born probably at Mardinu, on the south of Ctesiphon, between the years 214–218, and was brought up in the sect of the Mugthasila or Baptists, which his father had embraced.

edit. CURETON, translation by TH. HAARBRUCKER, *Shahrastani's Religionspartheien und Philosophenschulen*, Halle, 1850–1851. ABULFARAGIUS (+1286), *Historia orientalis*, edit. POCOCKE, Oxford, 1663–1672. The informations and extracts given by TABARI (10th century), AL-BIRUNI (11th century) and others. (2) The *Christian* sources: ST. EPHREM, chiefly *S. Ephraemi syri . . . opera selecta*, edit. OVERBECK, Oxford, 1865. ESNIK, *Réfutation des différentes sectes*, transl. by LE VAILLANT DE FLORIVAL, Paris, 1853. EUTYCHIUS, *Chronicle*, edit. POCOCKE, Oxford, 1628. — II. *Greek and Latin* sources: EUSEBIUS, *Eccl. Hist.* VII, 31. *Acta disputationis Archelai cum Manete* (*P. G.*, X). The refutations mentioned later on; the historians of heresies, especially ST. EPIPHANIUS, *Haer.* LXVI, and ST. JOHN OF DAMASCUS, *De haeresibus*, *Dialogus Contra Manichaeos*; PHOTIUS, *Biblioth.*, cod. 179; finally the treatises of ST. AUGUSTINE against the Manicheans. — Works: BEAUSOBRE, *Histoire critique de Manichée et du Manichéisme*, Amsterdam, 1734. FLUEGEL, *Mani, seine Lehre und seine Schriften*, Leipsic, 1862. K. KESSLER, *Mani, Forschungen über die manichaeische Religion*, Berlin, 1889. F. ROCHAT, *Essai sur Mani et sa doctrine*, Geneva, 1897.

Later on, he received special revelations, and when he was twenty-four years old, he began to preach his own system in Babylonia, Persia, Turkestan and even India. A plot of the Magi brought about his downfall. The King of Persia, Bahram I, had him seized and beheaded at Dschundisabur, about the years 274–275.[1]

It seems well proved that Mani himself set forth a complete body of doctrine. These are its most important features:

The foundation of the system is dualism: from all eternity, there are two principles, or rather two kingdoms that are opposed: the one, of Light; the other, of Darkness. Light is the good both physical and moral; Darkness, the evil. The kingdom of Light is ruled by the King of the Paradise of Light, God; the kingdom of Darkness first has no leader; but Satan, the primitive devil, soon comes out of its elements. These kingdoms are forever placed side by side in their lower and upper parts: yet they never blend together.

The confusion between both originates with Satan. He clothes himself with the five elements of Darkness: smoke, combustion, obscurity, warm wind, fog; and attacks the kingdom of Light. To resist him, God first produces an æon, the Mother of Life, and with her, the primitive Man, who, supplied with the five pure elements — gentle breath, wind, light, water and fire — has to defend the boundaries of the realm. In this struggle, the primitive Man is conquered and cast into prison. He is freed by God Himself, but in the clasp of Satan, the pure elements have combined with the dark ones. A mixed matter has arisen between Light and Darkness.

---

[1] The Fihrist ascribes to Mani seven principal works, traces of which are found also elsewhere. They are, in Syriac: (1) The *Book of Mysteries*, the Μανιχαίου Μυστηρία of St. Epiphanius (*Haer.* LXVI, 13; *Acta Archelai*, 52); (2) the Book of *Regulations for the hearers*, probably identical with the *Epistula fundamenti* of St. Augustine, and with the Κεφαλαίων βιβλίον of the *Acta Archelai* (52) and of St. Epiphanius; (3) the *Book of Giants;* (4) the letter to King Sapor, *Schâppûrakân ;* (5) the *Book of Quickening*, probably the same as the θησαυρός of St. Epiphanius (*Haer.* LXVI, 13; *Acta Archel.*, 52) or the *Thesaurus vitae* of other authors; (6) the Πραγματεία; (7) finally, in Persian, a kind of gospel opposed afterwards by the Manicheans to the Christian Gospels (*Acta Archel.*, 52). Several other works and letters are also quoted, and it is certain that the writings which originated from the master or his disciples were numerous; but most of them have been suppressed by the Church authorities.

It is out of this composite matter that God forms the actual world, in order gradually to disengage the luminous elements therein enclosed, and bring them back ultimately into the kingdom of Light. The sun and the moon are the instruments of that deliverance, for which, however, man must prepare the way. In him, as a matter of fact, Satan and his angels, who have created or begotten him, have chiefly concentrated the elements of Light. They have imprisoned them in his body as in a dungeon, and placed near him woman, the sensual seduction incarnate, in order to perpetuate, through generation, that imprisonment. Man is then made up of good and of evil, and on his conduct the deliverance more or less speedy, more or less complete, of what is pure and holy in himself and even in the world, actually depends. This is why he is constantly solicited in opposite directions by the demons and by the Angels: the former prompt him to vice, to idolatry; the latter teach him his true nature and warn him against the senses. The Angels have sent the Prophets of the true doctrine, perhaps Zoroaster, Buddha, Jesus, chiefly Mani, "the Guide, the Ambassador of Light, the Paraclete." By believing his teachings and fulfilling his commands, we may work effectively at the release of the luminous elements enclosed in ourselves and in the world, and thus reach salvation.

What are those commands? In general, they are the expression of a dualistic morality like the theory itself on which it rests, and ascetic in its tendencies. The principle is that we ought to abstain from every sensual enjoyment. The perfect Manichean carries three seals: the *signaculum oris*, which forbids him impure food, such as the flesh of animals, wine, etc., and obscene words; the *signaculum manus*, by which he is not allowed to handle certain objects in which the elements of Darkness are contained; the *signaculum sinus*, which forbids sexual relations, and therefore marriage. Besides, these prohibitions were supplemented by a whole series of minute prescriptions, of frequent fastings, prayers at a stated hour several times a day, ablutions, etc.

An asceticism so austere and practices so numerous could not, of course, suit the bulk of the Manichean believers, and would necessarily have impeded the spread of the sect. This is why they were obligatory only for those who wished to be perfect, for the "Elect," called also "Truthful." The latter alone pushed the respect for life in all its degrees so far as to abstain from cutting a plant or picking a fruit. As a reward, they were during their lifetime the object of the admiration and attentive services of the "Hearers," and, after death, could claim an immediate return into the Paradise of Light. As to the simple "Hearers," they were bound to keep the ten commandments of Mani, to avoid idolatry, lying, greed, murder, adultery, theft, bad teachings, witchcraft, religious doubt and laziness. On the whole their life resembled that of all men; therefore, after their death, they had to undergo a whole series of cleansings, before rejoining the Elect in the place appointed for their rest.[1]

It is easy to see that these two categories of believers correspond well enough to monks and to persons living in the world: besides, the Manichean Church possessed outside and above them, a hierarchy which was copied later on from the Christian hierarchy. At the head stood the Doctors or Teachers, who also had a Leader: according to St. Augustine, they were twelve; then came the Administrators (sons of knowledge), seventy-two in number, according to the same Father; finally the Elders or Presbyters, corresponding to Priests. Nay, later on, there were also deacons and missionaries.

---

[1] As to unbelievers and sinful Manicheans, they were condemned after their death, to wander until the end of time, then to be cast into Hell. In any hypothesis, let it be observed, there was no salvation for the body. After all the elements of Light had been taken from it, it was given up to Darkness whence it came.

As regards the Manichean worship, it seems at first to have remained quite simple and to have included only prayers, hymns and external expressions of adoration. There were among them neither temples, nor altars, nor images. Their chief feast was that of the Chair (*βῆμα*), kept in March in honor of Mani's death. However, they soon adopted several Christian festivals, as that of Pentecost, and rites similar to Baptism and to the Eucharist. This last ceremony was accompanied — according to some authors — by obscene and revolting practices which considerably altered the primitive purity of life the founder had intended to inculcate.

Thus constituted, Manicheism succeeded in gaining a widespread expansion. In the East, the sect, which at the beginning persecution had exiled beyond the Oxus, came back to Persia about the year 661, and later on set out once more for Samarcand and Sogdiana in the tenth century, and penetrated as far as Tibet, India and China. On the other hand, in the fourth and in the fifth century, it is found in Armenia and Cappadocia. Paulicianism at the end of the seventh, and Iconoclasm in the eighth century, contributed to spread its influence. Colonies of Manichean Armenians, transported into Europe by Iconoclastic Emperors, implanted it in Bulgaria, Macedonia, Thracia and Epirus, and developed it in the bosom of the Greek Church, under the names of Euchites, Enthusiasts and Bogomilians. From there it spread by means of missionaries, in Italy, France, Germany and England, and there became the germ of the heresy of the Cathari and of the Albigenses.

On the other hand, Manicheism had directly penetrated into the Roman Empire about the year 280. During the fourth century, it was prosperous in Africa, and, as we know, St. Augustine professed it for nine years. There the sect held its ground, in spite of the decrees of extermination enacted against it by Valentinian in the year 372, by Theodosius in the year 381, and by Honorius in the year 407, and thence it reached Spain, Aquitaine and Gaul. At Rome it had settled as early as the fourth century. It grew still stronger in the following century, when many African emigrants driven by the Vandals from their native land, arrived in Italy, and it persevered until the seventh century, under St. Gregory the Great. The Latin Manicheans were thus able to wait for those brethren who were to come from the Greek Empire, and work with them at the task of propaganda already mentioned.

However, that diffusion of the error was not effected without struggles, and ecclesiastical writers opposed Manicheism with vigorous refutations. Alexander of Lycopolis, who wrote the *Tractatus de placitis Manichaeorum*, at the end of the third or at the beginning of the fourth century, probably is not a Christian;[1] but Serapion of Thmuis (+ about 358),[2] Titus of Bostra (+ about 374),[3] perhaps George of Laodicæa (+ after 360),[4] St. Basil,[5] Didymus the Blind,[6] Diodorus of Tarsus,[7] composed works against the Manicheans, several of which have been preserved wholly or in part. St. Augustine himself wrote about twelve books against them.

Of these refutations, one of the oldest and very probably the most precious is the pamphlet entitled *Acta disputationis sancti*

---

[1] *P. G.*, XVIII, p. 412.

[2] *P. G.*, XL.

[3] P. de Lagarde, *Titi Bostreni contra Manichaeos libri quatuor*, Berlin, 1859.

[4] That is Draeseke's opinion. The work is in P. de Lagarde, *Op. cit.*

[5] The work is lost. Cf. St. Augustine, *Contra Julianum*, I, 16, *P. L.*, XLIV, 650.

[6] *P. G.*, XXXIX, 1085, foll.

[7] The work is lost, but mentioned by Photius, *Biblioth.*, cod. 85.

Archelai cum Manete.[1] Heraclian of Chalcedon assigns as its author a certain Hegemonius of whom nothing more is known.[2] In these *Acta*, interesting points of information are abundant and they may even contain documents that come from the time of Mani himself. The work belongs to the first half or to the middle of the fourth century.

Besides the arguments against Manicheism, several authors have called attention, in the Christology of the *Acta*, to the Adoptianist or even Nestorian tone of the 50th chapter. Mani charges Archelaus with making Jesus the Son of God by adoption, not by nature: "Ergo per profectum Filius videbitur et non per naturam?" To which Archelaus replies by distinguishing the Son of Mary from the Christ of God who came down upon Him and whom he seems to identify with the Holy Ghost: "Est enim qui de Maria natus est Filius, qui totum hoc quod magnum est voluit perferre certamen, Iesus. Hic est Christus Dei qui descendit super eum qui de Maria est . . . Cum resurrexisset ab inferis, assumptus est illuc ubi Christus filius Dei regnabat . . . Spiritum qui de caelis descenderat, per quem vox Paterna testatur dicens: *Hic est Filius meus dilectus*, nullus alius portare praevaluit, nisi qui ex Maria natus est super omnes sanctos Iesus."

---

[1] *P. G.*, X. Except a few fragments in Greek, we have only a Latin translation, which, from a recent discovery, may be ascribed to about the year 400. Cf. HARNACK, *Geschichte der altchrist. Litter.*, *Die Chronologie*, II, pp. 548, 549.

[2] PHOTIUS, *Biblioth.*, cod. 85; cf. HARNACK, *l. c.*

CHAPTER XIV

THE WESTERN THEOLOGIANS AT THE END OF THE THIRD AND AT THE BEGINNING OF THE FOURTH CENTURY

§ 1. — Arnobius[1] and Lactantius.

In the West no more, nay even less than in the East, do we find from St. Cyprian to the Council of Nicæa, a writer who was the worthy successor of the great theologians of old. Arnobius, Lactantius and perhaps Commodian himself are laymen, whose theological knowledge is shallow or unsafe, whose authority is insignificant, whose works retard rather than advance the general state of Christian teaching at their epoch.

Arnobius was a convert who, between the years 304–310, composed against the Heathen an *Adversus nationes*, destined, on the one hand, to refute their objections, on the other to show the absurd and immoral character of their belief, as well as the emptiness of their worship. The *Adversus nationes* is a polemical writing: therefore we should not expect to find in it either a professed or complete exposition of the Christian faith, the more so as the author was acquainted with it only imperfectly.

Among the happy features of his book, we may notice the emphatic profession of the divinity and of the humanity of Jesus Christ: "Deus, re certa, Deus, homo tamen natus,

---

[1] The edition quoted is that of *P. L.*, V. — Works: LECKELT, *Ueber des Arnobius Schrift Adversus Nationes*, Neisse, 1884. K. B. FRANKE, *Die Psychologie und Erkenntnislehre des Arnobius*, Leipsic, 1878. A. ROHRICHT, *Die Seelenlehre des Arnobius*, Hamburg, 1893. E. F. SCHULZE, *Das Uebel in der Welt nach die Lehre des Arnobius*, Jena, 1896.

Deus interiorum potestatum, Deus sublimis, radice ex intima" (I, 53, 42, 45-47, 49); the high idea he expresses of God: "Unus est hominis intellectus de Dei natura certissimus, si scias et sentias nihil de illo posse mortali oratione depromi" (III, 19); the affirmation of the freedom of faith (II, 65). Arnobius rejects the theory which ascribes to the soul a foreknowledge of things, which had preceded the actual knowledge it acquires and of which the latter was a mere remembrance (III, 19, ff., 28); he witnesses to the existence of prayer for the dead (IV, 36) and speaks (II, 14) of the unquenchable fire of Hell, which, however, he does not seem to regard as eternal (II, 14, 61).

Side by side with these happy features, we find also, in his book, many gaps and errors. Arnobius had been much struck with man's ignorance and physical and moral misery, and he pushes to a bitter pessimism the picture he makes of it, as well as the consequences he draws. He does not think we can know where we come from, nor the first cause of the evils that weigh upon us (II, 58). Nay, the origin and the destiny of the soul are for him insoluble problems. The soul is too puny and vicious to be the work of God (II, 37, 39, ff., 46, 48, 55); she is rather the work of subordinate powers whose nature we cannot exactly determine (II, 53). She is not immortal by essence: she becomes so only through God's mercy, if she fulfils His commands (II, 14, 31-33, 35, 36, 53); and as to the souls of the wicked, if they do not fully perish together with the body, it is because God has in store punishments that are for them a genuine death (II, 14). The author concludes as follows: "Ergo cum haec ita sint, non absone neque inaniter credimus mediae qualitatis esse animas hominum, utpote a rebus non principalibus editas, iuri subiectas mortis, parvarum et labilium virium: perpetuitate donari, si spem muneris tanti Deum ad principem conferant, cui soli potestas est talia corruptione exclusa largiri" (II, 53).

Arnobius has scarcely anything concerning Soteriology: just a mere allusion in Book I, 60; his Christology is very weak. He does not seem to have been a Docetist, in spite of some inaccurate expressions ("homine simulato," I, 61); but he establishes between the Word and the man in Jesus Christ a bond which is very weak indeed and unsatisfactory (I, 60). Thus, according to him, we should not say that Christ died; it was not Christ who died, but the man whom He carried: God cannot die. We are no more allowed to say Christ died, than we should be to say Apollo died, if the Sibyl whom the god inspired were killed at the very time of her inspiration: "Sed more est hominis interemptus? — Non ipse; neque enim cadere divinas in res potest mortis occasus . . . *quis* est ergo visus in patibulo pendere, *quis* mortuus est? — Homo quem induerat et secum ipse portabat . . . Mors illa, quam dicitis, assumpti hominis fuit, non ipsius, gestaminis, non gestantis, etc." (I, 62). Again, the author supposes that, at the death of Jesus Christ, the Word, departing from the body, appeared to the universe, such as He was, exclusively in His divinity; and this brought about the cataclysm which occurred then (I, 53).

We may add, that, in his refutation of Heathenism, Arnobius speaks in too general terms of the uselessness of temples, exterior worship and especially the use of incense in ceremonies (VI, 3; VII, 26–28). Although his criticisms no doubt refer only to the formalistic and coarse character of the Heathen religion and rites, yet, because of their lack of limitation and precision, they apparently condemn the most legitimate manifestations of the religious, nay of the Christian sentiment.

The influence of Arnobius does not seem to have been very deep during his lifetime. However, there was one man whom he had trained and who excelled him: this was Lactantius.[1]

---

[1] The edition quoted is that of *P. L.*, VI, VII. — Works: Ch. Leullier, *Etudes sur Lactance apologiste de la religion chrétienne*, Caen, 1846. Ch. Fr.

Born also in Paganism, he is the type of the philosopher and of the rhetorician who becomes a Christian without ceasing to be rhetorician and philosopher, who of course believes in the new doctrine, but who sees in it a high and refined form of monotheistic spiritualism, rather than the religion of the mysteries of Jesus Christ, of the Redemption and of the Cross. The Christian sentiment remained, so to speak, on the surface of his thought and of his work; it had no hold on his inmost thoughts; it did not well up from his soul, as from a deep spring. And thus, as he had not sufficiently either understood or assimilated the teachings of the Christian faith, Lactantius — though an elegant and tasteful writer — recorded and exposed them but imperfectly: "Utinam," St. Jerome exclaims, "tam nostra confirmare potuisset quam facile aliena destruxit!" [1]

This remark accounts for the considerable part which Apologetics strictly so called and the development of natural religious truths hold in our author's writings. He has left us in his *Institutions* a rather pleasing and somewhat strong demonstration of the divinity of Christianity by the Prophecies (I, 4); [2] by the predictions and courageous death of the Apostles (V, 3); by the sanctity of the lives of Christians in general (V, 9); by the heroism and great number of Martyrs (V, 13, 22); by the moral transformation wrought by the new faith (III, 25). He spoke of God, as a philosopher; he came back often and with a particular fondness to the dogma of Divine Providence, one of the truths to which he was most deeply attached, and one that inspired his small treatise *De opificio*

Jacob, *Lactance considéré comme apologiste*, Strasburg, 1848. M. E. Heinig, *Die Ethik des Laktantius*, Grimma, 1887. Fr. Marbach, *Die Psychologie des Firmianus Laktantius*, Halle, 1889. P. G. Frotscher, *Des apologeten Laktantius Verhältniss zur griechischen Philosophie*, Leipsic, 1895. R. Pichon, *Lactance*, Paris, 1901.

[1] *Epist.* LVIII, 10.

[2] All the references, unless expressly stated otherwise, are to the *Divinae Institutiones*.

Dei; he insisted likewise on creation (II, 5, 9; I, 3). However, his apologetic and philosophic tendencies have not prevented him from telling us, now and then, the contents of his Christian faith properly so called, and the conception he had of its mysteries.

For him, the birth of the Son of God cannot be accounted for; however, he goes on to say, since, according to Scripture, the Son is the Word of God, He probably came out of God's mouth, like a ringing voice and noise ("cum voce ac sono ex Dei ore processit," IV, 8), while the Angels issued from God in the midst of silence (*Ibid.*). Does that utterance of the Word bring about the existence of two gods? No, and Lactantius, who follows in Tertullian's footsteps, explains, as the latter had done before, the continuance of the divine unity, either through the unity of substance, or through the moral unity that exists between the Father and the Son: "Cum igitur et Pater Filium faciat et Filius patrem, una utrique mens, unus Spiritus, una substantia est: sed ille quasi exuberans fons est, hic tanquam defluens ex eo rivus; ille tanquam sol, hic quasi radius a sole porrectus . . . Quapropter cum mens et voluntas alterius in altero est, vel potius una in utroque, merito unus Deus uterque appellatur, quia quidquid est in Patre in Filium transfluit, et quidquid in Filio a Patre descendit" (IX, 29). Again, just as Tertullian before him, he falls into the error of the Word's temporal generation and into Subordinationism. On the former he is explicit: "Cum esset Deus ad excogitandum providentissimus . . . antequam ordiretur hoc opus mundi . . . produxit similem sui spiritum, qui esset virtutibus Dei Patris praeditus" (II, 9, col. 294; cf. IV, 6, col. 461; 8, col. 466, ff.): the Son was produced for the purpose of creation. As to Subordinationism, Lactantius pushes it so far that he seems to place on the same level the Son and the angel who afterwards became the devil, and declares that, if the Son is dear to God and approved of Him, it is because of His perseverance in doing good (II, 8, col. 295, ff.; cf. IV, 8, col. 467).

As regards the Holy Ghost, the works of Lactantius that have reached us contain nothing to signalize. St. Jerome, however, charged him with denying, in his letters to Demetrianus — now lost — His divine personality, and of identifying Him sometimes with the Father, sometimes too with the Son.[1] These are reproaches of which it is difficult now to say whether or not they are deserved.[2]

The Christology exposed by our author in the 4th book (6–30) of his *Institutions* is rather shallow and now and then very near inaccuracy. He always supposes — although he does not affirm it explicitly — the unity of person in Jesus Christ, and while, on the one hand, he uses sometimes terms that are inexact (v. g., IV, 10, 25), on the other, he knows and applies the *communicatio idiomatum* (IV, 15, 30). Again Jesus Christ is for him God and man, "Deus et homo . . . mediam inter Deum et hominem substantiam gerens" (IV, 13); hence His quality of mediator, μεσίτης, by which He is able both to serve as a model for men, and to teach and command them with authority (IV, 25). But Lactantius is mistaken when he sees in that ministry of teaching and example the chief purpose of the Incarnation, and the very essence of the Redemption. Nay, according to him, in order to make this example more complete, the Saviour became subject to concupiscence and temptation,[3] and He chose to be crucified simply to give in His own person a model to the low and the poor, and undergo a death that would preserve His body entire for the resurrection (IV, 26)!

---

[1] *Epist.* LXXXVIII, 7.

[2] All that we can remark is that Lactantius is not unwilling to call the Word a spirit (II, 9, col. 294; IV, 8, col. 467).

[3] "Ideo carne se induit, ut, desideriis carnis edomitis, doceret non necessitatis esse peccare, sed propositi ac voluntatis" (IV, 25, 24).

In our author's demonology we may remark this idea: after begetting the Son, the Father created first the angel who later on became the devil (II, 9, col. 294). As to the angels created afterwards, they, prompted by Satan, defiled themselves by intercourse with women. From them a second category of demons was born, who are neither angels, nor men, but earthly demons, the cause of all our evils (II, 15). It is easy to recognize in these notions the old Jewish Palestinian fables.

The anthropology of Lactantius is more serious and accurate. The world, he tells us, is made for man, and man for God (VII, 4, 5). Man is made up of body and soul. The latter does not come *ex traduce*, but immediately from God (*De opificio Dei*, 19, col. 73); nor does it exist before the body: it is born, so to speak, with it (*Div. Instit.*, III, 18, col. 406). It is of the essence of fire (II, 10, col. 310; 13, col. 322) and immortal (III, 18, col. 405, 406; 19; VII, 12, 13); yet it can suffer even after its separation from the body (VII, 20, col. 779, ff.; 21). The principle of sin does not precisely lie in the soul, but chiefly in the bodily appetites opposed to its aspirations (*De ira Dei*, 19, col. 135, foll.).

Lactantius touched just lightly on the question of the Church; nevertheless his words are precise: "Sola igitur catholica Ecclesia est quae verum cultum retinet. Hic est fons veritatis, hoc domicilium fidei, hoc templum Dei quo si quis non intraverit, vel a quo si quis exiverit a spe vitae ac salutis aeternae alienus est . . . Sciendum est illam esse veram in qua est confessio et paenitentia, quae peccata et vulnera quibus subiecta est imbecillitas carnis salubriter curat" (IV, 30, col. 542, 543). He extols highly the efficacy of Baptism: "Uno enim lavacro malitia omnis abolebitur" (III, 26, col. 432; cf. VII, 5, col. 753). Unfortunately, like Arnobius, he overstates so much the inutility of exterior worship that he seems not to suspect the existence, in the Christian society, of buildings, ornaments, pictures consecrated to the divine worship, in a word, of the whole liturgy (VI, 1, 2; II, 2–4). Again, in Ethics, he proclaims it unlawful to wage war, to accuse even a guilty man of a capital crime, and generally to condemn a man to death: a view quite worthy of that delicate soul, which disliked extremely any passionate gesture and held man as a sacred being: "Itaque in hoc Dei praecepto nullam prorsus exceptionem fieri oportet, quin occidere hominem sit semper nefas, quem Deus sanctum animal esse voluit" (VI, 20, col. 708).

The eschatology of Lactantius takes up the chapters 14–26 of the VIIth book of the *Institutions*, and is scarcely more than a mere reproduction of the Millenarian dreams and the popular legends then in vogue, blended with a few Origenistic features. Souls are not judged immediately after death, but only at the end of time: "Omnes in una communique custodia detinentur donec tempus adveniat quo maximus iudex meritorum faciat examen" (VII, 21, col. 802, 803). Now the world is to last 6000 years in all (VII, 14, col. 781), and more probably it has only 200 years more to last (VII, 25, col. 812). Terrifying signs and catastrophes will usher in its end (VII, 15). First a prince, coming from the North, will afflict the nations with the weight of a frightful tyranny (VII, 16). Antichrist will come after (VII, 17), and the just, besieged and pressed hard on all sides, will have no resource but to cry out to God: He will send His Son. After the defeat of Antichrist and the ruin of most of his followers, a first resurrection and a first judgment will take place, which will include neither idolaters nor those whose ungodliness is well known, viz., the renegades, but only those who have known and professed the religion of the true God (VII, 21, col. 802). God will judge them by fire: all indeed will pass through it; however, the perfect alone will not suffer therefrom (VII, 21, col. 802). The sinners that are punished will go and rejoin the wicked, to suffer with them in the same darkness, although, it seems, only for a finite and limited period: "Cum impiis in easdem tenebras recondentur ad certa supplicia destinati" (VII, 21). For the elect, their first reward will be a reign of a thousand years with Christ, a reign which our author describes in a most realistic way (VII, 22, 24). After that lapse of time, the devil, who had been bound, shall be released and stir up afresh against the just all idolaters that still remain. God Himself shall exterminate those enemies of His name and then the resurrection shall take place for the *iniusti*, viz., for heathens and apostates. They shall rise only to be condemned "ad cruciatus sempiternos" (VII, 26). Their flesh will modify, as it were, its nature, that it may not be destroyed by fire. That fire, unlike that of the earth, shall burn them and rebuild them up at the same time: "et cremabit impios et recreabit"(VII, 21, col. 802); it shall burn them, without consuming them (VII, 21). — In the mean time, the just shall obtain their definitive reward; transformed into angels, they shall live and reign with God for ever (VII, 26, col. 814).

§ 2. — Commodian.[1]

All that we know about Commodian comes from his own writings, and it is so meagre that so far scholars have been unable to determine with certainty either the time or the exact place of his literary activity. Harnack[2] assigns to it the period 260–350, and more probably the years that followed immediately the persecution of Diocletian. As regards the province where that activity was exercised, he does not venture to decide, though he feels inclined to designate the city of Rome itself.

---

[1] The edition quoted is that of B. Dombart, *Commodiani carmina*, Vienna, 1887. — Works: G. Boissier, *Commodien*, Paris, 1886. J. L. Jacobi, *Kommodianus und die altkirchliche Trinitätslehre*, in the *Deutsche Zeitschr. f. christl. Wissenschaft*, IV, 1853. L. Atzberger, *Geschichte der christl. Eschatologie innerhalb der vornicänischen Zeit*, Friburg in Brisgau, 1896, pp. 555–556.

[2] *Geschichte der altchristl. Litter., Die Chronologie*, II, p. 433, ff.; cf. 443, 449.

However this may be, and whatever Commodian was, whether a bishop or only an ascetic, the poems he has left us were written for the people's edification and far more with a view to strike their imagination and teach them their duties, than to expose theological speculations. However, some dogmatic passages have been noticed, and these are generally rather short, except those referring to eschatology. Unfortunately, they do not always reach the standard of orthodoxy.

This remark applies chiefly to some verses of a more decided patripassian and modalistic tendency. The author seems to see in the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, chiefly in the first two, merely different names given to the same person:

> Est Deus omnipotens, unus, a semetipso creatus,
> Quem infra reperies magnum et humilem ipsum.
> Is erat in verbo positus, sibi solo notatus,
> Qui pater et filius dicitur et spiritus sanctus.
> (*Carmen apol.*, v. 91, foll.)

God proclaimed Himself Son, when He manifested Himself and in order not to be recognized:

> Hic pater in filio venit, Deus unus ubique:
> Nec pater est dictus nisi factus filius fuisset.
> (*Carmen apol.*, v. 277, f.)
> Idcirco non voluit se manifestare, quid esset,
> Sed filium dixit se missum fuisse a patre.
> (*Carmen apol.*, v. 363, f.)
> Nam populus ille primitivus illo deceptus
> Quod filium dixit, cum sit Deus pristinus ipse, etc.
> (*Carmen apol.*, v. 617, ff.)

Then Commodian is led on, in connection with the Incarnation, to speak somewhat too vaguely of God's sufferings and death:

. . . Ligno vita latebat
Quo Deus pependit Dominus, vitae nostrae repertor.
(*Carmen apol.*, v. 327, f.)
. . . Deum talia passum.
(*Ibid.*, v. 357.)
. . . Deus passibilis.
(*Ibid.*, v. 414.)
Invidia diaboli mors introivit in orbem,
Quam Deus occulte destruxit, virgine natus.
(*Ibid.*, v. 775, f.)

The 8th *Instruction* of the IInd book contains, on penance and on the exercises with which it is accompanied, some interesting details, like those given by Tertullian:

Non fiet vacuum confusio culpae proinde,
In reatu tuo sorde manifesta deflere;
Tu si vulnus habes altum medicumque require,
Et tamen in poenis poteris tua damna lenire, etc.

The most extensive part of Commodian's theology is his eschatology. It is scarcely of any profit to analyze it in detail, after the exposition we have just made of that of Lactantius: for the former reproduces the latter nearly point by point, barring the Origenistic features.[1] We find the same blending of archaic data and of folklore: the belief that Nero is not dead and will be the first Antichrist; the second Antichrist's defeat ascribed to the remnants of the twelfth Jewish tribe, so far hidden beyond the Euphrates, under the leadership of the

---

[1] Let it suffice merely to point out the chief passages: Duration of the world (*Instructions*, I, 35, v. 6; II, 39, v. 8; *Carm. apol.*, v. 791, ff.). — Nero, the Antichrist (*Instruct.*, I, 41, v. 7, ff.; *Carm. apol.*, v. 825, ff.). — Second Antichrist (*Carm. apol.*, v. 887, ff.). — His destruction by the twelfth tribe (*Instr.*, II, 1; *Carm. apol.*, v. 941, ff.). — Millennium (*Instr.*, II, 3; II, 39, v, 12, ff.; *Carm. apol.*, v. 979, ff.). — General resurrection; end and renewal of the world; eternal punishment of the wicked and eternal happiness of the just (*Instr.*, II, 4; cf. I, 29, v. 16, ff.; II, 39, v. 8, ff.; *Carm. apol.*, v. 999, ff.; cf. 741, ff., 669, ff.)

Angel of the Most High; a realistic Millenarianism; in short, all the visions and narratives of the Apocalypse, understood in their most materialistic meaning, completed by all the commentaries with which the imagination of Christians had adorned them.

CHAPTER XV

THE DOCTRINE AND THEOLOGY OF THE CHURCH ON THE EVE OF ARIANISM

The following pages do not aim at exposing all that the Church believed or taught at the beginning of the fourth century; their purpose, far more modest, is merely to sum up the results of the investigation made in this volume, or rather to mark out, with as much precision as possible, the point of development which the chief Christian beliefs had reached and to which theology had gradually led them.

The authority of Scripture as source and standard of faith was universally acknowledged, and the New Testament Canon, if not yet fully determined and still counting some *ἀντιλεγόμενα*, included almost all the books we now find in it. In exegesis, two extreme methods had sprung into existence: one, the allegorical method, followed on the footsteps of Philo and Origen, and was inclined to sacrifice the letter to the doctrine or to the system; the other, the method of absolute literalism, studied in Scripture only syllables and words or the narrowest historical meaning of the text. It is worthy of remark that literalism was cultivated chiefly by the schools that ended in Adoptianism. However, between these two contrary methods, a third one, which aimed at combining the doctrine and the letter, and at finding out in the letter the expression and reason of the doctrine, tended to prevail, even at Alexandria: its followers stuck to the text, but they ascribed to it an absolute value; they saw in it as much a collection of formulas of faith, of which the Church had the understanding, as the history of the Revelation made by God to man.

The repeated condemnation of Sabellianism had placed beyond controversy the real distinction of the divine terms in the Trinity. Tertullian had already applied to them the word of *person*, and Origen, that of ὑπόστασις, which was generally received, although its use was to become exclusive only later on. The divinity of the Word or of the Son was an object of belief; yet it was rather inferred from the divinity of Jesus Christ than affirmed directly. The Son was born of the Father: He is then neither a κτίσμα nor a ποίημα, but of the Father's essence, ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας: we find in the Apologists the equivalent of this last expression, and after them, the very expression itself. However, there were yet two difficulties with which theologians were confronted on this subject, difficulties which had come from Greek Philosophy. If the Word was produced for the creation, His perfect birth was not eternal in the strictness of the term, and if He is creator, He approaches creation at least by one of His attributes: He is not the transcendent God. Temporal generation and subordinationism: — two consequences of the theory which looks upon the Word as the necessary instrument of creation. The former is set aside by Origen and the school of Alexandria, as well as by Pope Dionysius, in the name of the Roman Church; the latter is to hold its ground much longer and will be, in a great measure, the real and precise object of discussion during the Arian struggle. Anyhow, the word which is, one day, to bring everything to a close, the ὁμοούσιος has already appeared. The Alexandrians have uttered it, and Adamantius put it down in writing. True the Council of Antioch has rejected it, but only in the Sabellian meaning. On the other hand, perhaps its bearing has not yet been fully grasped; to show all its power, Athanasius will have to insist on the divine unity.

As regards the person of the Holy Ghost, He still remains nearly altogether beyond the field of theological study. In everyday language, He is spoken of as a truly divine person. Then, upon further consideration, some hesitations arise and apparently continue in the school of Origen: mere scruples of theorists, which the rest of the Church does not seem to have felt, and which the authority of Athanasius will remove by one word. It is through the Son that the Holy Spirit is connected with the Father: this view is to be set forth in the formula *a Patre per Filium.*

Of the questions concerning the Incarnation, only two were expressly treated and solved: that of the divinity of Jesus Christ against the Adoptianists, and that of the reality of His humanity, against the Docetæ. As regards the other points, scholars — Tertullian, whose formulas anticipate the future, being left aside — scholars stated only the premises of the solutions, or when they did formulate the solutions, they did so, outside any controversy. No difficulty was raised about the existence of the human soul in Jesus Christ: Origen's authority will later on do away with the sophisms of Apollinaris on this topic. The belief of the unity of person in Jesus Christ is, we may say, general: it shows itself chiefly in the use of the *communicatio idiomatum.* On the other hand, by maintaining that the Saviour is both true God and true man, and that, in becoming man, He has not ceased being God, the Fathers discard beforehand the various forms of Monophysitism and lay the foundations of the decrees of Chalcedon. The doctrine of the personal unity and of the twofold nature in Jesus Christ is then, substantially understood and admitted, at least by enlightened Christians — for among the ordinary people many vague notions still prevail: — however, the language does not always correspond to the thought, and the expression of the latter sometimes lacks precision and firmness.

Jesus Christ came to save and redeem us: with His death they associate this work of redemption and salvation. The blood of Jesus Christ is regarded as the price of our ransom paid to God's justice; this is already a way of satisfying; but another theory, still deeper and developed out of St. Paul, emphasizes this last idea, by exhibiting Jesus Christ as the representative of the whole humanity, expiating in its name. That is the theory of our *recapitulation* in the Saviour and also of His death considered as a sacrifice.

So far, Mariology is nearly all included in the article of the Creed: "*natus ex Maria Virgine.*" Angelology has not been treated with a precision worth mentioning: many theologians continue to follow Jewish interpretations, particularly as to the union of the sons of God with the daughters of men (*Gen.*, 6^2). On the other hand, the veneration paid to the Saints, and especially to the Martyrs, is practised and firmly established.

The theory of original sin is still to be framed; but its elements are mastered, and although nobody has a distinct and clear idea of what the hereditary fault is in itself, yet Christians are conscious at least of a physical and moral fall, consequent on our birth from Adam the sinner. Not until St. Augustine, will a teaching somewhat complete about actual grace be exposed: before him, the teaching of the Church consists merely in the general affirmation of the need in which we stand of God's help to do good, and also of the duty incumbent upon us to coöperate by our own deeds towards our salvation. Tertullian has vigorously sketched the theory of merit and of satisfaction, and the West has made it its own: in the East, the progress has been slower, and the relations of God and man are determined in a way less juridical and precise.

To the Africans, together with St. Irenæus, belongs the chief part in the development of Ecclesiology. It is a point settled long ago that there is only one true Church in whose bosom one can be saved; that in this Church herself, there must prevail, with the unity of hearts, the unity of creed and faith;

that one of her features is to be catholic, viz., spread all over the world. She possesses truth, and to preach it safely, enjoys the help of the Holy Ghost. Likewise she enjoys the power of remitting sins, all sins, and the exercise of that power is limited only by herself. Then too at the beginning of the fourth century, the legitimate claims of her hierarchy are firmly established and acknowledged. As priest, teacher and lawgiver, the bishop teaches, rules and administers and presides at the liturgy as well. To the Bishop of Rome, texts and facts no doubt ascribe either expressly or implicity a respect that is unique and a special authority, whose nature and extent, however, are not clearly determined.

One enters the Church through the Christian initiation which in its fulness comprises Baptism, Confirmation or Consignation, and the Eucharist. The doctrine of Baptism is nearly completed as regards the latter's function and effects, the subject who receives it, and the conditions to be verified on the part of faith in the minister who confers it. On this point, notwithstanding some divergences that will persist, the practice of Rome, in the Baptismal controversy, prevails over that of Carthage. Confirmation or Consignation, although distinct from Baptism, is normally, both in speech and in practice, seldom separated from it. In regard to the Eucharist, while on one hand, we find that it is generally and clearly represented,— we may perhaps except Clement of Alexandria and Origen — as the body and blood of Jesus Christ, on the other hand, nothing is explained or stated with precision as to the way in which that real presence of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament is conceived. From the remotest antiquity, the Eucharistic liturgy is regarded as a sacrifice destined to commemorate the Saviour's death. A true and full sacrifice, it is offered up, on stated days, and besides on the days of the *natalitia* of martyrs; it may be offered up for the departed.

We have already spoken in connection with the Church, of penance and of the forgiveness of sins: the three conditions of that forgiveness, viz., confession, expiation and the bishop's intervention are already pointed out by Tertullian and Origen. For the other rites, Extreme Unction and Matrimony, the documents of the first three centuries are silent, or say very little. About Order, they are a little more, though not very, explicit. Order is conferred through the laying on of the hands of the bishop, or of the bishop and of the clergy. In the middle of the third century, the lower Orders appear: in the West, five are reckoned: those of subdeacon, acolyte, exorcist, lector and porter; in the East, only that of lector is known.

During the period we have been studying, the morals of Christian communities encountered no less dangers than faith itself, and perhaps the chief danger did not arise from lax theories. Laxism bears with it its own denunciation: such is not the case with encratism and excessive rigorism, to which those strong generations felt naturally inclined, as towards higher forms of virtue. But the wisdom of the Church treated these exaggerations as they deserved. The distinction between precepts and counsels was laid down; and while the fulfilment of the former was deemed an essential condition for salvation, the practice of the latter was left to the initiative of more generous souls. The Christian ideal was not lowered; on the other hand, in order to reach it, the obligation was imposed on nobody of leaving the common paths of life.

Moreover the passionate impulses towards extraordinary ways, which at the beginning resulted from the expectation of an impending judgment, and from the threats of death in the midst of which life was spent, those impulses had considerably decreased at the beginning of the fourth century when the parousia did not appear so near, and when the edict of Milan seemed to have closed the era of persecutions. At that time, the calculations of Lactantius and of Commodian as to the end of the world disturbed but few, and Millenarian dreams had lost many believers among instructed Christians. The hierarchical authority did not pay much attention to them. Christians did not see clearly yet, when the final retribution would take place after death. On the other hand, the resurrection of the body was universally admitted, although Origen's school understood it in a sense against which emphatic protests were already being raised. His theory of the *apocatastasis*, contrary — we should remark — to all previous and contemporary tradition, had apparently not yet won great sympathy, and was to find only later on an echo in ecclesiastical writers. So far, Christians contented themselves with the past affirmations of an everlasting Hell in store for sinners, and of an endless life in God's company, as a reward for the just.

This sketch of the state of theological doctrine on the eve of Arianism shows the Church settled on the foundations of her belief, and after all, ready, when the occasion may demand it, to define its great lines. The organ of these definitions was to be the hierarchy, and it is because the prerogatives of that hierarchy were acknowledged, that the Church will be able to impose her decisions and to repel the attacks aimed at them. Unfortunately, that hierarchy itself will be often divided, and rivalries of individuals as well as doctrinal divergencies will prolong beyond all measure disputes which might have come to an end after a few hours' earnest discussion. Nevertheless, by being kept up for many years, these controversies will bring about a more complete explanation of the Gospel revelation and a more noticeable progress of the Christian society in the understanding of its faith.

INDEX

INDEX

AGADAH or HAGGADAH, 31
ADOPTIANISM, in Hermas, 115, 116. Adoptianism at Rome, its abettors, its doctrine, 287, ff. Adoptianism in the treatise *De montibus Sina et Sion*, 365. Adoptianism of Paul of Samosata, 400, foll.
ALLEGORISM. Its origin among the Jews of Alexandria, 45. Used in the Epistle of Barnabas, 139; by Clement of Alexandria, 246; by Origen, 261
ALOGI. Teaching of, 198
ANGELOLOGY, of Palestinian Judaism, 35; of Philo, 52–53; of Jesus Christ, 61; of the Apocalypse, 98; of Hermas, 116; of the Apologists, 224
ANTHROPOLOGY, of Palestinian Judaism, 36; of Hellenic Judaism, 47; of the Gnostics, 177, 178; of the Apologists, 224, ff.; of St. Irenæus, 235; of Origen, 274; of Methodius, 393; of Lactantius, 418
ANTICHRIST, in Palestinian Judaism, 41; in St. Paul, 85, 86; in the *Didache*, 138; in the Epistle of Barnabas, 141; in St. Cyprian, 365; in Lactantius, 419; in Commodian, 442
APELLES. Doctrine of, 189, foll.
APOCRYPHA of the Old Testament, Palestinian, 32; Judæo-Hellenic, 46; Apocrypha quoted by the Apostolic Fathers, 106
APOLOGISTS of the 2nd century. Their apologetics; their theology, 206, foll.
ARTEMON. Error of, 289

BAPTISM. Teaching of Jesus Christ, 68, 74; of St. Paul, 82; of the Acts, 95; of Hermas, 118; of the second Epistle of St. Clement, 120; of St. Ignatius, 129; of the *Didache*, 136; of the Epistle of Barnabas, 140; of the Elkesaites, 168; of the Apologists, 225; of St. Irenæus, 238; of Clement of Alexandria, 254; of Origen, 276; of St. Hippolytus, 302; of Tertullian, 321; of St. Cyprian, 361; of Methodius, 395. Baptism of heretics, 366, ff. Teaching of Pope Stephen, 370; of St. Cyprian, 369, ff.; of Firmilian, 371; of the *Liber de rebaptismate*, 373, 374. Arguments of both parties, 371, foll.

CALLISTUS. Was he a Sabellian? 294. His decree on penance, 343, foll.
CERINTHUS. System of, 157
CHRISTOLOGY of Jesus Christ Himself, 62, 72; of St. Paul, 80, ff.; of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 89; of the Synoptists, of the Acts and of St. Peter, 92; of St. John, 97, 101; of St. Clement, 108; of Hermas, 115; of the second Epistle of St. Clement, 120; of St. Ignatius, 122, ff.; of St. Polycarp, 133; of the Epistle of Barnabas, 139; of the Gnostics, 178; of Marcion, 185; of the Apologists and especially St. Justin, 221, ff.; of St. Irenæus, 236; of Melito, 240, 241; of Clement of Alexandria, 250, 251; of Origen, 271, ff.; of St. Hippolytus, 301; of the *Philosophoumena*, 304; of Tertullian, 316, ff.; of Novatian, 329, 330; of the *Tractatus Origenis*, 334; of Dionysius of Alexandria, 378; of Peter of Alexandria, 392; of Methodius, 394; of the Adamantius, 397; of the *Acta Archelai*, 411; of Arnobius, 414; of Lactantius, 417
CONFESSION OF SINS, in the *Didache*, 136; in the Epistle of Barnabas, 140; in Origen, 276; in Tertullian, 339; in St. Cyprian, 363
CONFIRMATION, in the Acts, 95; in St. Hippolytus, 302; in Tertullian, 322; in St. Cyprian, 362
COUNSELS (EVANGELICAL). Teaching of Jesus Christ, 66, 67; of St. Paul, 85; of St. Ignatius, 131; of Tertullian, 324; of St. Cyprian, 364
CREATION. Doctrine of creation in Palestinian Judaism, 35; in Philo, 52; in Gnosis, 176; in Apelles, 189; in the Apologists, 214, ff.; in Origen, 268; in the *Philosophoumena*, 303

DEMONOLOGY of Palestinian Judaism, 36; of Philo, 53; of Jesus Christ, 61, 62; of St. John, 99; of the Apologists, 224; of Lactantius, 418

Descent of Jesus Christ to Limbo. Teaching of St. Peter, 93; of Marcion, 186

Development of Dogma; its theory, 6, note

Divinity of Jesus Christ. Teaching of Jesus Himself, 63–64, 72–73; of St. Paul, 80; of St. John, 98, 101; of St. Clement, 108; of the second Epistle of St. Clement, 120; of St. Ignatius, 123; of the Ebionites, 163; of the Essene Ebionites, 165; of the Elkesaites, 168; of Marcion, 185; of St. Justin, 222; of St. Irenæus, 236; of Melito, 240

Docetism, refuted by St. Ignatius, 124; by St. Polycarp, 133; by Tertullian, 316. Gnostic Docetism, 158, 178; of Marcion, 185; of Apelles, 189; of Clement of Alexandria, 250

Dogma. Meaning of the word, 1; what is Dogma, 1–2

Ebionites. Teaching of, 163

Ebionites (Essene). Teaching of, 164, foll.

Ecclesiology of Jesus Christ, 67, 74; of St. Paul, 83; of the Acts, 94; of Hermas, 117, 118; of the second Epistle of St. Clement, 120; of St. Ignatius, 126, 127; of the "Martyrium" of St. Polycarp, 134; of Clement of Alexandria, 254; of Origen, 276; of St. Hippolytus, 301; of Tertullian, 320; of Novatian, 331; of St. Cyprian, 356, ff.; of Methodius, 395; of the Adamantius, 398; of Lactantius, 418

Elkesaites, 167, foll.

Encratism, in Hermas, 113. The Encratites, 190, ff. Encratism in Hieracas, 390

Episcopacy, in St. Paul, 84; in St. Clement, 109; in Hermas, 117; in St. Ignatius, 127, ff.; in the *Didache*, 138; in St. Cyprian, 358, foll.

Eschatology of Palestinian Judaism, 40, ff.; of Hellenic Judaism, 48; of Jesus Christ, 68, ff.; of St. Paul, 85, ff.; of the Apostles, besides St. Paul and St. John, 96; of St. John, 99, ff.; of Hermas, 118; of the second Epistle of St. Clement, 121; of St. Ignatius, 132; of the Epistle of Barnabas, 141; of the Gnostics, 180; of Marcion, 186; of the Apologists, 226, 227; of St. Irenæus, 239, 240; of Clement of Alexandria, 255; of Origen, 280, ff.; of St. Hippolytus, 302, 303; of the *Philosophoumena*, 304; of Tertullian, 325, ff.; of Novatian, 331; of St. Cyprian, 365; of the Adamantius, 399; of Lactantius, 419, ff.; of Commodian, 422

Essenes, 163

Eternity of punishment, in Palestinian Judaism, 42; in Hellenic Judaism, 48; in the teaching of Jesus Christ, 70, 75; in St. Paul, 87; in St. John, 100; in Hermas, 119; in the second Epistle of St. Clement, 121; in St. Ignatius, 132; in the Epistle of Barnabas, 141; in the Clementine Homilies, 166; in the Apologists, 227; in St. Irenæus, 240; in Clement of Alexandria, 256; in Origen, 281, 282; in St. Hippolytus, 302; in the *Philosophoumena*, 304; in Tertullian, 326; in St. Cyprian, 365; in Arnobius, 413; in Lactantius, 420; in Commodian, 422, note.

Ethics. Ethical teaching of Seneca, 25; of Philo, 53; of Jesus, 65, ff.; of Hermas, 113, ff.; of the Gnostics, 180; of Marcion, 186; of Tertullian, 323, 324; of St. Cyprian, 364, 365; of Methodius, 395; of Lactantius, 419

Eucharist. Teaching of Jesus, 68; of St. Paul, 84; of the Acts, 95; of St. Ignatius, 129, 130; of the *Didache*, 136, 137; of St. Justin, 226; of St. Irenæus, 238, 239; of Clement of Alexandria, 254, 255; of Origen, 278, 279; of St. Hippolytus, 302; of Tertullian, 322; of St. Cyprian, 362; of Dionysius of Alexandria, 378; of the Adamantius, 398

Extreme Unction. Teaching of St. James, 96

Faith. Teaching of Jesus on faith, 65; teaching of St. Paul, 82; of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 90; of St. James, 93; of St. Clement, 110; of St. Ignatius, 131; of Marcion, 186; of St. Irenæus, 238; of Clement of Alexandria, 252; of Origen, 275; of St. Cyprian, 364

Flesh. Teaching of Philo, 53; of St. Paul, 78; of St. Jude, 94; of the Gnostics, 176, 178

Generation. Doctrine of the temporal generation of the Word, in the Apologists, 217, ff.; in St. Hippolytus, 299, 300; in Tertullian, 311, 313; in Novatian, 328; in Lactantius, 416

Gnosticism. Judaizing Gnosticism, in the Epistle to the Colossians, 153; in the Pastoral Epistles, 154; in the Epistles of St. Ignatius, 158. Origin of Gnosticism, in II Peter and in Jude, 155; in the

Epistles of St. John, 156; in the Apocalypse, 156. Pagan Gnosticism in the 2nd century, its origin, teachings, and various forms, 170, ff. Danger into which it brought the Church, 181. The Christian Gnostic, according to Clement of Alexandria, 252, foll.

God. Teaching about God and His attributes in Palestinian Judaism, 33; in Hellenic Judaism, 47; in Philo, 49; in the personal teaching of Jesus, 62; in St. Paul, 77; in St. John, 97, 101; in St. Clement, 107; in Hermas, 114; among the Gnostics, 175; in Marcion, 185; in Apelles, 189; in the Apologists, 213; in St. Irenæus, 232; in Clement of Alexandria, 247; in Origen, 263; in Tertullian, 310; in the Adamantius, 397; in Arnobius, 413

Grace. Teaching of Philo, 53; of St. Paul, 79; of Origen, 274

Halakha, 31

Hierarchy, in St. Paul, 84; in the Acts, 94, 95; in St. Clement, 109; in Hermas, 117; in St. Ignatius, 127, ff.; in St. Polycarp, 133; in the *Didache*, 137; in Tertullian, 320

History of Dogmas. What it is, 2. In what it differs from the History of Theology, 3; from Positive Theology, 4; from Patrology and from Patristics, 4; from Historical Theology, 4. Its starting-point, 5. Its sources, 7. Various methods that may be followed, 8. Its divisions, 9. Chief works on the History of Dogmas, before the 19th century, 11; during the 19th century, in Germany, 12; in France, 15; in Italy, 16; in England and the United States, 16

Holy Ghost. Teaching of Palestinian Judaism, 33; of Jesus Christ, 68, 74; of St. Paul, 83; of the Synoptists, of the Acts and of St. Peter, 92; of St. John, 99; of St. Clement, 107; of Hermas, 115; of the Montanists, 194; of the Apologists, 220; of St. Irenæus, 234; of Clement of Alexandria, 249; of Origen, 266, 267; of St. Hippolytus, 300, 301; of Tertullian, 311, 313; of Novatian, 329; of the *Tractatus Origenis*, 334; of Dionysius of Alexandria, 385; of Theognostus, 386, 387; of Pierius, 387; of Hieracas, 389, 390; of Methodius, 393; of the Adamantius, 397; of Lactantius, 417

Images, honor paid to, 388

Incarnation. See Christology

Judæo-Christians, contemporary of St. Paul: their origin and teaching, 150, ff.; Judæo-Christians in the 2nd century, see Nazarenes, Ebionites, Ebionites (Essene), Elkesaites

Judgment (Last), in Palestinian Judaism, 42; in the personal teaching of Jesus, 69, 75; in that of St. Paul, 87; in the Epistle to the Hebrews, 91; in St. Peter, 96; in St. John, 100; in St. Clement, 110; in Hermas, 119; in the second Epistle of St. Clement, 121; in the Epistle of Barnabas, 141; among the Gnostics, 180; in St. Hippolytus, 303

Kingdom of God, in Palestinian Judaism, 39; in the personal teaching of Jesus, 60; in St. Paul, 85

Lapsi. Various categories of *lapsi*, 346, 347. How they are dealt with in Africa, 347, ff.; at Rome, 349, ff.; by the Novatians, 351–353; at Alexandria, 378, 392

Law (The Old). How far it is obligatory: teaching of Palestinian Judaism, 37; of Hellenic Judaism, 45; of Jesus Christ, 66; of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 89, 94; of St. Peter and of St. James, 93, 94; of the Epistle of Barnabas, 139. Controversies on the subject, 150, ff. Doctrine of Cerinthus, 158; of the Ebionites, 163; of the Essene Ebionites, 166, 167; of the Elkesaites, 168; of the Gnostics, 176. Opposition between the Law and the Gospel in Marcion, 184; in Apelles, 189

Magisterium of the Church. Teaching of the Apostolic Fathers, 106; of St. Ignatius, 128; of St. Irenæus, 230, ff.; of Tertullian, 308

Manicheism. Its origin, 405; its founder, 405; its speculative and moral teaching, 406, ff. Its hierarchy and worship, 408, ff. Its diffusion, 409, 410. Refutations of Manicheism, 410, 411

Marcion and Marcionitism, 183, ff.; Marcion's disciples and successors, 188

Marriage. Teaching of Jesus, 66; of St. Paul, 85; of Hermas, 114; of St. Ignatius, 130; of the Essene Ebionites, 166, 167; of Apelles, 189; of Tatian, 190; of the Encratites, 191; of the Montanists, 194; of Tertullian, 323; of St. Cyprian, 364; of Hieracas, 390

Martyrdom: a supplement for Baptism, 276, 346, 362

Martyrs. Their power of reconciliation, 344, 346, 350
Mary. Teaching of St. Ignatius, 123; of Tertullian, 317
Melchisedekians. Their error, 289. Error of Hieracas, 390
Merit, in the doctrine of Jesus, 70; in St. Paul, 87; in St. James, 93; in St. Ignatius, 132; in Tertullian, 319, 320; in Novatian, 331; in the *Tractatus Origenis*, 333; in St. Cyprian, 364
Messias. The idea of the Messias in Palestinian Judaism at the time of Jesus, 38, ff.; in Hellenic Judaism, 48; Jesus claims to be the Messias, 62
Metempsychosis, in Classical Paganism, 20; in the Clementine Homilies, 165; among the Elkesaites, 168
Millenarianism, in Palestinian Judaism, 41; in the Apocalypse, 100; in Papias, 135; in the Epistle of Barnabas, 141; in Cerinthus, 158; in Montanism, 195; in St. Justin, 227; in St. Irenæus, 240; in St. Hippolytus, 302; in Tertullian, 325, 326; in Methodius, 396; in Lactantius, 419; in Commodian, 423. The Millenarian Doctrine and its opponents, 199, foll.
Modalism. Its beginnings in St. Justin, 286; its form during the 3rd century in the Pentapolis, 379, ff.; in Commodian, 421
Monarchianism (Patripassian). Its abettors, its doctrine, 290, ff. Opposition made to it, 293, ff. Monarchianism in Commodian, 421
Montanism and Montanus. Doctrine, spread, adversaries of Montanism, 192, foll.

Nazarenes (Judæo-Christians), 161
Nicolaitans. Errors of, 156; origin, 157
Novatian and Novatianism, 351–353

Ὁμοούσιος. The word in Origen, 265. Dionysius of Alexandria is reproached with not using this word, 381. The Adamantius uses it, 397. A Council of Antioch rejects it, 403
Order (Sacrament of), Ordination, in the Acts, 95; in St. Cyprian, 364

Paganism (Classical Greco-Roman) at the time of the coming of Jesus. Its beliefs and ethics, 18, ff. Origin of pagan polytheism, according to the Apologists, 211
Patripassianism. *Cf.* Monarchianism
Paul of Samosata, his errors, his condemnation, 400, ff.
Penance. Teaching of Jesus, 65; of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 90; of Hermas, 112, ff.; of the second Epistle of St. Clement, 121; of Clement of Alexandria, 255; of Origen, 276, ff.; of Tertullian, 338, ff., 345, ff.; of Callistus, 343, ff.; of St. Cyprian, 347, ff., 363; of Commodian, 422
Philosophy. Its state at the time of the advent of Jesus, 22, ff.; its alliance with religion during the first and second centuries, 27. Attitude assumed towards it by the Apologists, 207; particularly by St. Justin, 207, ff.; by Clement of Alexandria, 245; by Origen, 261; by Tertullian, 307; by Dionysius of Alexandria, 378; by St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, 388
Prayers for the Dead, in Hellenic Judaism, 48; in Tertullian, 323; in St. Cyprian, 363; in Arnobius, 413
Predestination. Teaching of Jesus Christ in St. John, 74; of St. Paul, 83
Preëxistence. The idea of preëxistence in Palestinian Judaism, 35; applied to the Messias, 39. Jesus declared He existed before the world, 73; so also St. Paul, 80; and the Epistle of Barnabas, 139
Prescription (Argument from), in Tertullian, 309
Priesthood of Jesus, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, 89; in St. Clement, 108; in St. Ignatius, 126; in St. Polycarp, 133; in the "Martyrium" of St. Polycarp, 134
Primacy of St. Peter, in the Synoptists, 67; in Clement of Alexandria, 254; of the Roman Church, in St. Ignatius, 129; in St. Irenæus, 231; in St. Cyprian, 359, foll.
Purgatory (Doctrine of), in Origen, 280; in Tertullian, 325

"Recapitulatio" (Doctrine of), in St. Paul, 81, ff.; in St. Irenæus, 236, 237; in Melito, 241; in Methodius, 394
Redemption. See Soteriology
Relics, honor paid to, 134
Resurrection of the Dead, in Palestinian Judaism, 42; in Hellenic Judaism, 48. Teaching of Jesus, 69, 75; of St. Paul, 86; of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 91; of St. John, 100; of St. Clement, 110; of the second Epistle of St. Clement, 121; of the "Martyrium" of St. Polycarp, 134; of the *Didache*, 138; of the Gnostics, 180; of Apelles, 189; of the

Date Due

FACULTY	~~FACULTY~~	~~FACULTY~~	
FACULTY	~~FACULTY~~		
	~~FACULTY~~	~~JUN 15 1971~~	
	~~MAY 4 '61~~	~~JUN 15 1972~~	
AP 13 '50			
	~~FACULTY~~	~~JUN 15 1973~~	
FACULTY	FEB 19 '62	~~APR 2 0 '78~~	
FACULTY	MAR 5 '62	~~DEC 31 1978~~	
	MAR 19 '62		
FACULTY	~~APR 2 '62~~	~~Mending~~	
	~~FACULTY~~	~~JUN 15 1981~~	
FACULTY	~~FACULTY~~	~~JUN 15 1987~~	
FACULTY	~~FACULTY~~		
	~~FACULTY~~	~~JUN 15 1999~~	
DE 3 '52			
FACULTY	~~FACULTY~~	JUN 30 2013	
FACULTY	~~FACULTY~~		
FACULTY	~~FACULTY~~		
FEB 22 '57	~~SEP 17 '65~~		
MAR 12 '57	~~AUG 27 '65~~		
~~MAR 20 '58~~			
	~~FACULTY~~		

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01044 7011